DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 066 144 HE 003 368

TITLE	The Status of Women Faculty at Bowling Green State University.
INSTITUTION	Bowling Green State Univ., Ohio.
PUB DATE	May 72
NOTE	83p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Equal Opportunities (Jobs); Females; *Feminism; *Higher Education; *Sex Discrimination; *Women Professors

ABSTRACT

In response to the increasing concern in the academic professions about the systematic sex bias faced by women academicians, the Faculty Senate of Bowling Green State University appointed an Ad Hoc committee on the Status of Women Faculty in the fall of 1971. The committee was charged with conducting an empirical study on existing sex differentials in areas of particular concern to University faculty. The committee found in its study that sex discrimination does exist at Bowling Green in the areas of hiring, promotion, tenure, rank, numbers, and salary. Thus, recommendations are made by the committee concerning: (1) the implementation of an affirmative action program; (2) the appointment of an assistant provost for women; (3) the organization of a permanent Commission on the Status of Women; (4) the equalization of status of men and women faculty; (5) the appointment of women to policymaking posts; (6) equality in hiring practices; and (7) the inclusion of child-care and maternity leave provisions in faculty contracts. (HS)

THE STATUS OF WOMEN FACULTY

at

BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY

Report of the Faculty Senate
Ad Hoc Committee on the Status
of Women

May, 1972

Bowling Green, Ohio

". . . the spirit behind the movement for women's liberation . . . is properly a movement for the liberation of the species, attended though it has been by folly, and greeted chiefly with derision -- the usual harbingers of a decisive change in our conception of humanity."

-- Emile Capouya, writing in Saturday Review, June 26, 1971

Our study of the status of women, 1972, Bowling Green State University, has brought us into contact with some folly, and not a little derision. We have known some moments of discouragement as we became aware of the depth of the problem. The sure knowledge of the growing potential for decisive change, however, continues to buoy us up and spurs us to resolve that every possible effort will be made to realize that change here.

We wish to acknowledge with thanks the assistance of Stanley K. Coffman, Provost, in providing us with access to personnel data and a grant-in-aid for clerical and graduate assistance. We extend thanks, too, to Hollis A. Moore, President, and to the Board of Trustees, for alerting the University community to the importance of implementing equal opportunity.

This report is a first step in what must be a continuing analysis and evaluation of how well the University recognizes and utilizes the contribution of all its various members and provides for the development of their potential.

The Ad Hoc Committee on the Status of Women

Greer Litton Fox, Chairperson, Sociology

Carlene Bagnall Blanchard, American Studies and English

Martha Eckman, English

Rena Foy, Education

Kathleen H. Merriam, Political Science

FOREWORD

As a foreword to the present study, the Ad Hoc Committee on the Status of Women Faculty has felt it would be wise to place our study in the perspective of its historical and professional development. Since we do not stand outside the tradition of the feminist movement, we believe that a brief review of historical events will contribute to an understanding of what our study has attempted to present.

The Equal Rights Amendment which passed our national Congress in March of this year was first introduced in Congress in 1923, only three years after the ratification of the 19th Amendment. The E.R. Amendment has since been introduced at every session of both the House and the Senate, and both political parties of the nation have traditionally included recommendations for its approval. Not until the contemporary women's movement gained national prominence, however, has any real interest been devoted to the Equal Rights Amendment by legislators. In the interim, President Kennedy established a Commission on the Status of Women in 1961, but eleven years passed before sufficient pressure could bring Congress to address itself seriously to women's issues.

We believe that the feminist movement as it has developed during these years is both serious and political, and that it will change the structure of American society more completely than any other contemporary

movement for social change. As a preliminary to action, it is studying, seeking new answers to old stereotyped assumptions about both men and women. This group of assumptions is what feminists call "sexism": rigidly preconceived notions about appropriate behavior patterns, and social roles based solely on sex differences. Historically the goal of the feminist movement has been the elimination of this sex-role system.

In many ways, the women's movement is involved with fundamental change: it has redefined politics by re-examining in political terms social institutions (e.g., professional rights and privileges, the institutions of marriage and family, including parental and community responsibility for child-rearing), and it recognizes that women are beginning to define themselves as a political group which includes all females, regardless of socioeconomic, national, racial, or religious differences.

Perhaps the only demands of the women's movement which have received widespread verbal acceptance are those dealing with (1) equal pay for equal work, and (2) equal job opportunities. But national and local statistics have for years refuted the myth that job equality exists. Thus, the women's movement has found that job-opportunity discrimination and wage disparities are strategic points for directing activities for change.

In the academic world, sociology, psychology, and political science scholars were the first three occupationally-oriented feminist groups. All three were formed in September, 1969. The fourth group was formed in December, 1969, within the Modern Language Association (professors and scholars in linguistics, English, and foreign languages). The

chairman of the M.L.A. Commission for the Study of Women, Florence Howe, presented two public lectures on the Bowling Green State University campus in May. Professor Howe reported her findings on a national survey of U.S. colleges and universities which reveal some startling statistics about sex discrimination. Her own summary of the commission report is terse and truthful: "Most schools say to women, in effect, you can study here, but you can't work here."

Since these four academic groups were formed, other disciplines -- American Studies, economics, history, and library science -- have developed commissions or caucuses to study the status of women, so that today practically every professional association has a women's action organization. Although numerous associations, including the A.A.U.P. and A.A.U.W., have passed resolutions on women's issues, most of these resolutions have not been translated into official policy, let alone action at the local institutional level.

In addition to professional associations, many individual colleges and universities have established commissions, caucuses, or committees -- either within or outside the official institutional channels -- to study the status of women. Our Ad Hoc Committee, established by the Bowling Green State University Faculty Senate, is directly within the mainstream, therefore, in studying the status of its women faculty members and in opening the door to the study of enrollments, admissions policies, and status of both undergraduate and graduate women students. Although our obligation to the Faculty Senate technically will be completed with the presentation of this report, we request that the Senate establish a permenent Commission on the Status of Women. If we are to give more than

lip service to the ideal of reform at our own institution, the status of women will require continuous study; the Faculty Senate is, in conjunction with the university administration, the logical political unit to continue that study.

I. INTRODUCTION

Statement of Purpose

The existence of sex discrimination in institutions of higher education has become a topic of concern and research on campuses throughout the nation. An outgrowth of such research is the troubling recognition that the status of women in American academic institutions has actually deteriorated in the last four decades. The probability of attainment of a college education for females relative to males has worsened since World War II.[1] The percentages of women faculty are smaller, especially in the higher ranks; salary differentials between men and women are greater.[2]

In response to the increasing concern in the academic professions about the systematic sex bias faced by women academicians, the Faculty Senate of Bowling Green State University appointed an Ad Hoc Committee on the Status of Women Faculty in the fall of 1971. The committee was charged with conducting an empirical study on existing sex differentials in areas of particular concern to University faculty. In addition, the committee was to submit a body of recommendations for corrective action on sex biases at the University, as deemed appropriate on the basis of the committee's study.

---

[1]Jeanne Clare Ridley, "The Changing Position of American Women: Education, Labor Force Participation, and Fertility," in Family in Transition, Fogarty International Center Proceedings, No. 3, National Institute of Health, 1969, p. 207.

[2]Patricia Albjerg Graham, "Women in Academe," Science (169:3952), September 25, 1970, pp. 1284-1290.

The committee presented a preliminary report to the Faculty Senate on December 7, 1971. In that report, evidence was presented suggesting a pattern of discrimination by sex in numbers, location by subject area, rank, and salary. On the basis of such evidence, the committee recommended the following guideline to the Senate:

> That department chairmen and committees of all departments concerned with promotion, salary, and tenure and with recruitment and hiring address themselves to the problem of pattern discrimination by sex which exists in rank, salary, and numbers of women at Bowling Green State University.

This recommendation was amended by the Senate to read "...pattern discrimination by sex if it is found to exist in rank..."

The present report, the final report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Status of Women Faculty, is an elaboration and extension of materials contained in the preliminary report. Our conclusion has not changed from that of our earlier report: on the basis of our study, we find substantial evidence to suggest pattern discrimination by sex in hiring, promotion, tenure, rank, numbers, and salary.

Data and Methods

The data upon which our report is based were drawn from personnel files maintained by the Office of the Provost. Included are 691 full-time teaching faculty members. Part-time instructors, branch faculty, library and administrative personnel (with or without faculty rank), and non-academic employees were not included. All salary data reported here reflect academic-year salary levels; that is, when necessary, twelve-month salary levels have been adjusted downward, according to the current AAUP formula, to reflect a ten-month salary level. All time-specific

characteristics (such as current rank, tenure status, years of service, salary level) reflect an individual's status as recorded in his/her personnel file in October, 1971.

Because we wanted our report to be readable and understandable to an audience of widely-varying methodological sophisitication, we have used only simple analytic procedures. Most of our analyses are based upon frequency and percentage distributions and controlled contingency analysis.

The measures most commonly used in this report are the mean, the median, the mode, and the percentile. These measures can be useful summarizing devices and are defined as follows: The mean is the simple arithmetical average. The mean score for a group is found by dividing the sum of the individual scores by the number of cases in the group. The median is the point that divides a group equally, when all the qualifying cases have been arranged in order. That is, half of a group will fall below the median and half of the group will fall above the median. The mode is simply the score that occurs most often in a group. When two different scores occur the same number of times in a group, we speak of the group as bimodal. The percentile indicates the highest score for any given percentage of the group, when all the cases have been arranged in order. The numerical score at the 80th percentile, for example, means that 80% of the group score at that level or below. Note that the median is the 50th percentile.

Outline of the Report

The remainder of the report falls into three sections. The first section identifies certain areas of patterned sex bias by a comparison

of female and male faculty at Bowling Green in terms of numbers and locations, hiring patterns, salary, rank, promotion, and tenure. The next section looks at two specific types of responses to the problem of sex discrimination: 1) the growth and development of Women's Studies programs as a response of educational institutions to the demands for greater knowledge about women; and 2) the legal recourse open to academic women at all levels in their quest for equal employment opportunity. According to Florence Howe,"The most 'lady-like' and dignified route that women can take to equity is the legal route." The legal route to equity will be examined briefly. The final section of the report contains a body of recommendations for efforts that can be made at this University in order to promote the more effective and equitable development, utilization, and recognition of the skills of women at Bowling Green.

II. THE STATUS OF WOMEN FACULTY

A. NUMBERS AND LOCATION

Patterns of Distribution

Table 1 presents the numerical and percentage distributions of men and women faculty by rank and tenure status for each department. Also included in Table 1 are the distributions of male and female post-masters, masters, and undergraduate major students in each department.

There are 129 full-time women faculty, less than 1/5 of the total full-time faculty at Bowling Green. Women are a minority on all four college faculties, as the following figures suggest:

Arts & Sciences	<1 in 7 faculty is female
Business	1 in 20 faculty is female
Education	<2 in 5 faculty are female
Music	1 in 8 faculty is female

In sum, while we find women faculty in all of the colleges, we also find them to be a mere fraction of their respective college faculties.

Fields and Patterns of Concentration

In what areas do we find women faculty at Bowling Green? Are the women found evenly distributed throughout departments in the university, or are they concentrated or clustered in only a few? The answer is clearly the latter, as shown in Tables 2 and 3. Table 2 shows, for example, that more than half of the women employed at BGSU are in the

TABLE I : NUMBER & PERCENTAGES OF WOMEN AND MEN FACULTY BY RANK AND TENURE STATUS FOR DEPARTMENTS WITHIN EACH COLLEGE

COLLEGE:	Number & Percentages Within Department					Number At Each Rank								Number & Percentages With Tenure			
						Prof.		Assoc.		Asst.		Instr.					
	M	%	W	%	Total	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	%	W	%
Arts & Sci.																	
Physics	11	100			11	1		2		7		1		5	45		
Mathematics	31	100			31	6		5		20				11	35		
Geography	16	100			16	5		3		4		4		8	50		
Psych Clinic	1	100			1	1								1	100		
History	27	96	*1*	*04*	28	7	*1*	8		9		3		17	63	*1*	*100*
Psychology	29	94	*2*	*06*	31	10	*1*	14	*1*	5				15	52	*1*	*50*
Philosophy	14	93	*1*	*07*	15	1		2	*1*	7		4		5	36	*1*	*100*
Sociology	20	91	*2*	*09*	22	5		5	*1*	8	*1*	2		9	45	*1*	*50*
Geology	10	91	*1*	*09*	11	4		3	*1*	3				8	80	*1*	*100*
Art	21	88	*3*	*12*	24	7		3		11			*3*	15	71		
Biology	23	88	*3*	*12*	26	7		7	*2*	9			*1*	14	61	*3*	*100*
Chemistry	15	88	*2*	*12*	17	5		5	*1*	4		1	*1*	8	53	*1*	*50*
Political Sci.	13	87	*2*	*13*	15	4		1		6	*2*	2		5	38	*1*	*50*
Speech	31	84	*6*	*16*	37	7		9	*3*	11	*2*	4	*1*	16	52	*3*	*50*
English	41	74	*14*	*26*	55	8	*1*	10	*2*	10	*4*	13	*7*	19	46	*3*	*21*
German/Russ.	8	73	*3*	*27*	11	1			*2*	2		5	*1*	2	25	*3*	*100*
Romance Lang.	12	57	*9*	*43*	21	4	*1*	2	*1*	4	*3*	2	*4*	5	42	*5*	*56*
TOTALS	323		*49*		372	83	*4*	79	*15*	120	*12*	41	*18*	163		*24*	
PERCENTAGES		87		*13*		95	*5*	84	*16*	91	*9*	69	*31*		50		*49*
Business																	
Journalism	8	100			8	1		1		6				2	25		
Business Law	4	100			4	2		1		1				3	75		
Marketing	9	100			9	4		2		3				5	56		
Finance & Ins.	7	100			7	2				4		1		2	29		
Management	9	100			9	3		1		3		2		3	33		
Q.A.C.	21	96	*1*	*04*	22	5		6		5		5	*1*	10	48		
Economics	16	94	*1*	*06*	17			5	*1*	10		1		4	25	*1*	*100*
Business Ed.	10	83	*2*	*17*	12	3	*1*	2		2		3	*1*	3	30	*1*	*50*
Computer Sci.	4	80	*1*	*20*	5	2		1		1			*1*	2	50		
TOTALS	88		*5*		93	22	*1*	19	*1*	35	*0*	12	*3*	34		*2*	
PERCENTAGES		95		*05*		96	*4*	95	*5*	100		80	*20*		39		*40*
School of Music																	
Theory	9	100			9			2		7				2	22		
Perf. Studies	25	89	*3*	*11*	28	6		5	*2*	9	*1*	5		13	52	*2*	*67*
Music Educ.	7	78	*2*	*22*	9	2		2		1	*1*	2	*1*	4	57		
Music	1	50	*1*	*50*	2	1							*1*	1	100		
TOTALS	42		*6*		48	9	*0*	9	*2*	17	*2*	7	*2*	20		*2*	
PERCENTAGES		88		*12*		100		82	*18*	89	*11*	78	*22*		48		*33*

TABLE I : NUMBER & PERCENTAGES OF WOMEN AND MEN FACULTY BY RANK AND TENURE STATUS FOR DEPARTMENTS WITHIN EACH COLLEGE

COLLEGE:	Number & Percentages Within Department					Number At Each Rank								Number & Percentages With Tenure			
						Prof.		Assoc.		Asst.		Instr.					
	M	%	W	%	Total	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	%	W	%
Education																	
Indus. Arts	14	100			14	3		3		7		1		8	57		
Coll. Student Personnel	2	100			2	1		1						1	50		
Men's H.P.E.	35	100			35	1		5		17		12		14	40		
Women's H.P.E.			*23*	*100*	*23*		*3*		*5*		*8*		*7*			*12*	*52*
Education	54	72	*21*	*28*	75	14	*3*	13	*1*	17	*6*	10	*11*	28	52	*4*	*19*
Lib. Sci. & Inst. Med.	2	40	*3*	*60*	5				*1*		*1*	2	*1*			*1*	*33*
Home Eco.	2	08	*22*	*92*	24		*3*		*1*		*8*	2	*10*			*10*	*41*
TOTALS	109		*69*		178	19	*9*	22	*8*	41	*23*	27	*29*	51		*27*	
PERCENTAGES		61		*39*		68	*32*	73	*27*	64	*36*	48	*52*		47		*39*

TABLE I : NUMBER & PERCENTAGES OF WOMEN AND MEN GRADUATE STUDENTS & UNDERGRADUATE MAJORS FOR DEPARTMENTS WITHIN COLLEGES

COLLEGE:	Number & Percentages Post-Masters Students					Number & Percentages Masters Students					Number & Percentages Undergraduate Majors				
	M	%	W	%	Total	M	%	W	%	Total	M	%	W	%	Total
Arts & Sci.															
Physics						4	80	1	20	5	53	91	5	09	58
Mathematics	3	100			3	19	68	9	32	28	183	51	178	49	361
Geography	1	100			1	16	89	2	11	18	52	80	13	20	65
Psych Clinic	5	83	1	17	6	34	67	17	33	51	3	100			3
History	3	100			3	27	82	6	18	33	378	70	161	30	539
Psychology	42	69	19	31	61	37	66	19	34	56	167	55	134	45	301
Philosophy						8	100			8	15	63	9	37	24
Sociology	6	100			6	16	57	12	43	28	129	38	213	62	342
Geology						18	95	1	5	19	90	79	24	21	114
Art	5	83	1	17	6	9	56	7	44	16	124	31	276	69	400
Biology	20	71	8	29	28	37	79	10	21	47	444	64	249	36	693
Chemistry						16	89	2	11	18	159	64	91	36	250
Political Sci.	1	50	1	50	2	14	100			14	129	79	34	21	163
Speech	43	74	15	26	58	45	54	38	46	83	216	37	371	63	587
English	43	69	19	31	62	38	57	28	43	66	227	33	441	66	668
German/Russ.	1	100			1	6	60	4	40	10	10	27	27	73	37
Romance Lang.			7	100	7	3	14	18	86	21	29	14	173	86	202
TOTALS	173		71		244	347		174		521	2,408		2,399		4,807
PERCENTAGES		71		29			67		33			50		50	
Business															
Journalism											226	71	93	29	319
Business Law											123	90	14	10	137
Marketing						1	100			1	329	87	48	13	377
Finance & Insur.											148	95	8	5	156
Management	10	91	1	9	11	110	96	5	4	115	301	89	37	11	338
Q.A.C.						21	100			21	443	84	85	16	528
Economics						10	100			10	42	96	2	4	44
Business Ed.						14	48	15	52	29	406	69	185	31	591
Computer Sci.											43	64	24	36	67
TOTALS	10		1		11	156		20		176	2,061		496		2,557
PERCENTAGES		91		9			89		11			81		19	
School of Music															
Theory											8	67	4	33	12
Perf. Studies											23	60	15	40	38
Music Educ.						1	100			1	135	47	153	53	288
Music			2	100	2	22	55	18	45	40	1	25	3	75	4
TOTALS			2		2	23		18		41	167		175		342
PERCENTAGES				100			56		44			49		51	

TABLE I : NUMBER & PERCENTAGES OF WOMEN AND MEN GRADUATE STUDENTS & UNDERGRADUATE MAJORS FOR DEPARTMENTS WITHIN COLLEGES

COLLEGE:	Number & Percentages Post-Masters Students					Number & Percentages Masters Students					Number & Percentages Undergraduate Majors				
	M	%	W	%	Total	M	%	W	%	Total	M	%	W	%	Total
Education															
Indus. Arts	1	100			1	26	96	1	4	27	286	98	13	2	299
Coll. Student Personnel	4	67	2	33	6	26	51	25	49	51	1	33	2	67	3
Men's H.P.E.	1	100			1	42	100			42	331	96	13	4	344
Women's H.P.E.			1	100	1	1	10	9	90	10	22	6	342	94	364
Education	59	63	34	37	93	119	54	102	46	221	323	14	1,935	86	2,258
Lib. Sci. & Inst. Med.											6	12	43	88	49
Home Eco.											27	7	375	93	402
TOTALS	65		37		102	214		137		351	996		2,723		3,719
PERCENTAGES		64		36			61		39			27		73	

TABLE II: MALE AND FEMALE FACULTY BY COLLEGE - BGSU, 1971

College	Male N	Male %	Female N	Female %	Total N	Total % Female
Arts & Sciences	323	57	49	38	372	13
Business	88	16	5	4	93	5
Music	42	8	6	5	48	12
Education	109	19	69	53	178	39

TABLE III: Number, Per Cent and Cumulative Per Cent Distributions of Full-Time Women Faculty - By Number of Women in Department BGSU, 1971

Number of Women Faculty in Dept.	DEPARTMENTS N	%		Cum.	WOMEN FACULTY N	%		Cum.
0	13	35.1		35.1%	0	0.0		0.0%
1	7	18.9	70.2%	54.0%	7	5.4	14.7%	5.4%
2	6	16.2		70.2%	12	9.3		14.7%
3 - 5	5	13.5		83.7%	15	11.6		26.3%
6 - 9	2	5.4	29.8%	89.1%	15	11.6	85.3%	37.9%
10+	4	10.9		100.0%	80	62.1		100.0%
TOTAL	37	100.0			129	100.0		

College of Education. In contrast, fewer than 1 man in 5 is in that College. Moreover, another 38% of women are found in the College of Arts and Sciences. Three-quarters of these are in the "Arts" while the remainder are divided evenly between the "Social Sciences" and the "Natural Sciences."[1] Thus, even within colleges, we find pockets of concentration rather than even distributions; and the clusters are found in typical "female" areas: English, Speech, Romance Languages.

Table 3 suggests that of the 37 departments at Bowling Green, 26 (70 per cent) have two or fewer women on the faculty, half of these having no women at all. Stated differently, 15 per cent of the female faculty are spread over 70 per cent of the departments, while the remaining 85% of the women are clustered in 11 (or 30%) of the departments. Indeed, three departments (Education, Women's HPE, and Home Economics) account for more than half of the women faculty employed at Bowling Green. (Even with the high concentration of female faculty, however, women in the College of Education are still outnumbered 3 to 2 by their male colleagues.)

Faculty-Student Sex Ratios

Table 4 summarizes data on male/female ratios at faculty and student levels in each of the four colleges. It is evident from Table 4 that as we move from undergraduate major to master's level, to post-master's, to faculty in every college the proportion of females diminishes at each level.

---

[1]The number of women in each of the departments is given in parentheses. (See also Table 5 of this report)

"Arts":	Art (3); Speech (6); English 14); German & Russian (3); Romance Languages (9); History (1); Philosophy (1)	37
"Natural Sciences":	Biology (3); Chemistry (2); Geology (1); Physics (0); Math (0)	6
"Social Sciences":	Geography (0); Political Science (2); Psychology (2); Psych. Clin. (0); Sociology (2)	6
		49

TABLE IV: SEX RATIO AND PER CENT FEMALES OF FACULTY, GRADUATE STUDENTS, AND UNDERGRADUATE MAJORS FOR EACH COLLEGE BGSU, 1971

Arts & Sciences:	M : F	% Female
Faculty	323/ 49	13
Post-Masters	173/ 71	29
Masters	347/ 174	33
U.G. Major	2,408/2,399	50
Business:		
Faculty	88/ 5	5
Post-Masters	10/ 1	9
Masters	156/ 20	11
U.G. Major	2,061/ 496	19
Music:		
Faculty	42/ 6	12
Post-Masters	0/ 2	*
Masters	23/ 18	44
U.G. Major	167/ 175	51
Education:		
Faculty	109/ 69	39
Post-Masters	65/ 37	36
Masters	214/ 137	39
U.G. Major	996/2,723	73

* N too small to calculate stable percentage.

In three of the four colleges (the College of Education is the exception) the proportion of women graduate students is higher than the percentage of women faculty. In every college the proportion of women undergraduate majors far outstrips the proportion of women faculty (see Figure 1).

We can use the College of Arts and Sciences to illustrate what these data might mean. In the College of Arts and Sciences, one of every two undergraduate students is a male, but more than 6 of every 7 faculty is male. The male student/faculty ratio is approximately 7 to 1; that is, male faculty members teach about 7 male students apiece -- assuming faculty service to students follows sex lines. What are the corresponding female ratios? The female student/faculty ratio is 49 to 1; female faculty members teach approximately 50 women students apiece.

Obviously, the notion that faculty service follow sex lines is an artificial one in terms of the conventional service that professors offer. Male professors teach and advise female students as well as male students, and although it is far less probable numerically, female professors teach and advise both male and female students.

It is in the area of role modeling that adult males and adult females might well serve students of their same sex rather more than students of the opposite sex. The importance of role modeling for career aspirations of college students is no longer an issue. However, whether the sex of the role models is an important factor in career aspirations and career choice is still at issue.[2] If having a same-sex role model is a factor

---

[2]Elizabeth M. Almquist and Shirley S. Angrist, "Role Model Influences on College Women's Career Aspirations," Merrill-Palmer Quarterly 18:3, July 1971. Cf. also, Pamela Robey, "Structural and Internalized Barriers to Women in Higher Education," in Toward a Sociology of Women, C. Safilios-Rothschild, eds., Lexington: Xerox, 1972.

in career choice, then clearly male students at the undergraduate level have the advantage over female students (essentially the same is true at graduate levels) in terms of having large numbers of tangible examples of career options in a broad variety of areas. In 29 of the 37 departments at Bowling Green, neither undergraduate nor graduate women students have a model of an academic woman at the highest professional rank in their department.

It is difficult to believe that the career choices of undergraduate women (primarily home economics, nursing, social work, and education)[3] are a random phenomenon. It seems rather more likely that the career choices of young women reflect the career patterns observable among their available role models. (Similarly, the low level of career aspirations among young women might well reflect the general paucity of role models except in a few "female" fields.)

One way of examining this question is to look at the degree of similarity between pattern of choice-of-major among undergraduate students with the pattern of specialization among faculty of the same sex. If the availability of same-sex role models plays a part in career choice, then we might expect the pattern of choice-of-major among undergraduates to reflect the pattern of specialization of faculty of the same sex more closely than the specialization pattern of faculty of the opposite sex. That is, we might expect undergraduate women's choice-of-major to be more similar to the specialty areas of female faculty than to those of the male faculty. Likewise, we might expect male undergraduates to resemble the male faculty more closely than the female faculty in terms of specialization;

---

[3] Handbook on Women Workers, 1969, Woman's Bureau Bulletin 294, U.S. Dept. of Labor, pp. 190-199.

at the same time, however, we might find a more variable pattern of choice-of-major among undergraduate men, consonant with the greater variety of career options open to men.

Table 5 shows numerical and percentage distributions of faculty and undergraduate majors among six broad areas of specialization at Bowling Green. Visual inspection of the percentage distributions in the table reveals the pattern of concentration of women students and faculty in the humanities and in education, while men are seen to be comparatively more evenly distributed among the six areas of specialization.

We have computed indexes of dissimilarity comparing specialization patterns of faculty and students of the same sex and of the opposite sex.[4] It is clear from the indexes that the greatest similarity in specialization patterns is between female students and female faculty. That is, female undergraduates largely mirror the specialties of faculty women. Moreover, female students look more like female faculty than male students look like male faculty in terms of specialization patterns. In general, students reflect the career specialties of the faculty of the same sex more than they reflect the specialties of the faculty of the opposite sex. Further, this relationship is stronger for the women undergraduates than for their male counterparts.

We also were interested in the magnitude of sex differences in specialization areas and whether or not we could detect a change over time as we moved from a comparison of male and female students to a comparison of male and

---

[4]The index of dissimilarity summarizes how different two groups are in their percentage distributions on a given characteristic. The index may be interpreted as the amount of redistribution necessary in one group to make its distribution on the given characteristic exactly equal to that of the other group. A value of 0% indicates complete similarity while 100% indicates complete dissimilarity; larger values thus indicate higher degrees of dissimilarity. /The value of the index is computed as $\Sigma|d|/2$, or one-half the sum of absolute differences between the two groups./

TABLE V: NUMERICAL AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTIONS OF AREAS OF SPECIALIZATION OF FACULTY AND UNDERGRADUATE MEN AND WOMEN WITH INDICES OF DISSIMILARITY FOR STUDENT-FACULTY AND MALE-FEMALE PAIRS BGSU, 1971

AREAS OF SPECIALIZATION:	FACULTY				U.G. STUDENT MAJOR*			
	Male		Female		Male		Female	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Music	42	7.5	6	4.6	167	3.0	175	3.0
Business	88	15.7	5	3.9	2,061	36.6	496	8.6
Education	109	19.4	69	53.6	996	17.7	2,723	47.0
Humanities [a]	154	27.4	37	28.7	999	17.7	1,458	25.2
Social Science [b]	79	14.0	6	4.6	929	16.5	394	6.8
Natural Science [c]	90	16.0	6	4.6	480	8.5	547	9.4
TOTAL	562	100.0	129	100.0	5,632	100.0	5,793	100.0

INDEX OF DISSIMILARITY

a.	Female faculty - female student	11.7%
b.	Male faculty - male student	23.4%
c.	Male faculty - female student	27.6%
d.	Female faculty - male student	48.5%
e.	Female faculty - male faculty	35.5%
f.	Female student - male student	37.7%

* Refers to number of students with declared majors in these fields Fall, 1971.

[a] Includes departments of art, speech, German & Russian, romance languages, English, history, philosophy.

[b] Includes departments of geography, political science psychology, psychology clinic, sociology.

[c] Includes departments of biology, chemistry, geology, physics, mathematics.

female faculty. The final two indexes of dissimilarity give us a crude measure of sex segregation in areas of specialization. We can see that the indexes are relatively large and are of the same order of magnitude at both academic levels. That is, the differences in specialization patterns between men and women are as great at the student level (37.7%) as they are at the faculty level (35.5%). There is no evidence of a convergence of career choice between the sexes. Rather, whatever the source of influence, the differential channeling of men and women into career fields is still as strong among the current generation of students as it was among the persons who are now faculty members.

Implications

What are some implications of such patterns in number and concentration? We have already suggested the possibility of impact upon career aspirations and career choice among undergraduate (and graduate) students. Some other possible implications are the following: 1) Students are exposed to women professors in a rather limited range of subject areas, most especially those taught within three or four departments. 2) Women professors are a minority in all but three departments. This means that in some departments women academicians can be virtually isolated professionally, a serious concern in a profession in which access to rewards and prestige appear to depend heavily on collegiality.[5] 3) Such patterning contributes to invisibility of women except in a few traditionally "female" areas.

---

[5]Patricia Albjerg Graham, "Women in Academe," Science (169:3952), Sept. 25, 1970, pp. 1284-1290. Ann Sutherland Harris, "The Second Sex in Academe," AAUP Bulletin, Fall 1970.

B. HIRING PATTERNS

Hiring Practices

Before considering specific hiring patterns at Bowling Green, let us gain a broader perspective on the topic. A full description of hiring practices should ideally compare the characteristics of those who are not successful (measuring "success" as "being hired") with those who are successful at each step in the recruitment and hiring process. However, a university faculty includes only the "successful" competitors in the hiring process. This means that an unknown proportion of the ideal study population is just that -- unknown and unavailable. In assessing hiring patterns, therefore, it must be kept in mind that, like the proverbial fish that got away, the characteristics of women (and men) who were not hired are more subject to fancy than to fact. It may be, for example, that brilliant women are often rejected in favor of men of more mediocre talents. The fact is, however, that we have no way of documenting such charges because of data limitations.

In addition to information on the recruits, both successful and unsuccessful, it would be desirable to have information on the selection process itself. The costs of being female in the hiring process of the national academic marketplace have been described, decried, and documented with enough frequency and recency to make additional elaboration unnecessary here.[6] We can include a paragraph on this topic from the University of Washington Report on the Status of Women:

---

[6]See, for example, Theodore Caplow and Reece J. McGee, The Academic Marketplace (New York: Basic Books, 1958); Jessie Bernard, Academic Women (Cleveland: Meridian Books, 1964); Harris, "Second Sex in Academe;" and Graham, "Women in Academe."

> An important area where sex discrimination appears is the informal and sometimes semi-secret grapevine of job information that extends from department to department across the country. "The cliche opening, 'Do you know a good man for the job?" results in continuous but largely unconscious discrimination against women. The grapevine is largely based on friendship; because men generally have other men as friends, and because women are such a small proportion of any profession that their communication networks are usually inadequate, predominant use of informal channels for recruitment and other professional activity will leave women at a serious disadvantage. Many women's groups are demanding adherence to the Office of Federal Contract Compliance's stipulation that all job openings be openly advertised to insure equal access; this is even more necessary at the present time, when an oversupply of Ph.D.'s further militates against the hiring of women."[7]

Finally, it would be desirable to have information on the gatekeepers who, at various points in the recruitment and hiring processes, make decisions not only to reject or to hire but who also decide upon the rank, salary, and tenure status of the recruit upon entry into the university faculty. It is possible that the decision-makers base their decisions on personal opinions and prejudices about the desirability of women as faculty members. For example, a recent study of chairmen of psychology departments across the nation uncovered a pattern of sex bias in hiring. Heads of 115 psychology departments read paragraphs describing job applicants with either male or female names, rated the candidates according to their desirability, and indicated at what level they would be offered a position. The pairs of descriptions were identical except for the applicant's sex. Women were offered lower ranks of appointment than men for 7 of 8 paragraphs and were rated less desirable for 6 of 8 paragraphs.[8]

---

[7] University of Washington, Report on the Status of Women, p. 10.

[8] Linda Fidell, "Empirical Verification of Sex Discrimination in Hiring Practices in Psychology" (in press, American Psychologist); see also L. Simpson, "A Study of Employing Agents' Attitudes Toward Academic Women in Higher Education" (Ph.D. dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1968).

The biases of the decision-makers that are productive of such hiring patterns may often be non-conscious and unintentional. They are less well-known and discussed than are the structural biases built into the hiring process itself. It may be worthwhile to consider just a few of these briefly.

Women are poor job risks: they don't use their degrees; they have less professional commitment than men; they prefer part-time to full-time work.

In fact, full-time participation in the labor force increases with educational attainment.[9] A 1967 study of 1964 women who received Ph.D.'s in 1958 or 1963 showed that 96% of single women and 87% of married women without children were working full-time: of the married women with children, 60% work full-time and an additional 25% were working part-time.[10] A 1970 study of 1979 women ten years after they received their Ph.D.'s showed that 91% were working, 81% full-time, and 79% had not interrupted their careers during the decade.[11]

Women are unstable: they get sick, quit their jobs more often than men. "You hire a woman and first thing you know she quits to get married or to have a baby."

In fact, according to the 1969 figures of the Department of Labor's Woman's Bureau, the sick-leave (including pregnancy leave) and turnover rates for women are slightly lower than those of men with the same

---

[9] Handbook of Women Workers, 1969, pp. 204-205.

[10] Rita James Simon, Shirley Merritt Clark, and Kathleen Galway, "The Woman Ph.D.: A Recent Profile," Social Problems, Vol. 15, Fall 1967, p. 223.

[11] Helen Astin, The Woman Doctorate, 1970, quoted by M. J. Scully, "Women in Higher Education Challenging the Status Quo," The Chronicle of Higher Education (February 9, 1970), pp. 2-5.

occupation and income.[12] Moreover, academic women tend to remain single and to have small families if they do marry.[13]

Women belong in the home: "A woman can't have a family and be a truly dedicated professional at the same time. Either her children or her career will suffer, probably both."[14]

This bias is often, though not always, an unconscious one and reflects a societal norm that suggests that occupational roles are for men while parenthood is for women.[15] There is no recognition of the contradiction implicit in the assumption that a man's children will not suffer from his total absorption in himself and his career. Stated differently, the traditional sex role bias suggests that while married men can have families and simultaneously can be expected to be distinguished academicians, married women cannot. Such a bias may differentially enter into consideration of qualifications and potentials of men and women job applicants, when hiring decisions are made, and undercut a married woman professional's probability of being hired.

Women are less productive than men: women publish less and therefore will contribute less to the national visibility of a department than will a man.

---

[12]Facts About Women's Absenteeism and Labor Turnover. August 1969, Cf. also Handbook, pp. 76-80.

[13]Jacquelyn A. Mattfeld and Carolyn G. VanAken, eds., Women and the Scientific Profession (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1965), pp. 63, 75.

[14]Statement made by member of Sociology Department Graduate Committee, Brown University, to author, April 13, 1972.

[15]John Sirjamaki, "Culture Configurations in the American Family," American Journal of Sociology 53 (May 1948), pp. 464-470.

Presumably because of the difficulty of evaluating relative productivity, empirical information on this matter was scarce. However, in their study of female Ph.D.'s mentioned above, Simon, et al. (1967), found that on four measures of productivity (articles, books, grants, consulting), the sex differences were slight (p. 231, Table 9). In fact, in terms of articles and books, "married women publish as much or more than men and unmarried women publish slightly less than men " (p. 231).

Women are less mobile than men: "It is a waste of (scarce) recruitment resources to go after a married woman professional because either she is not likely to leave her husband and family and relocate elsewhere or else we would have to find a job for her husband, too. It's easier and cheaper to recruit men."

As far as we could tell, the "mobility bias" remains more a matter of opinion than of fact. Studies of job mobility of professional women and men are in progress but results were unavailable to us at the time of this writing.

The "mobility bias" is particularly interesting because it illustrates the flexibility and double-edged nature of many biases applied to women. On the one hand, women are not recruited because they probably won't move anyway; that is, women aren't mobile enough. At the same time, women are not hired because it is argued that women will follow their husbands if and when the husband is offered a position elsewhere; that is, women are too mobile.

Underlying both applications of the mobility bias is a societal norm that assumes that the career of the husband should take precedence over

that of the wife;[16] that is, the wife will "follow" where the husband goes and/or will not leave without him if she is offered a better position elsewhere. This is "institutional sexism" in the sociological sense; but it translates into -- and indeed is reinforced by -- sexism in educational institutions.

Moreover, there is a tendency to assume that a department should not and cannot hire a woman professional unless a job is also found for her husband. That this is often a realistic assumption is not the point here. The point is that the assumption isn't made in the complementary situation. That is, in hiring a male professional, it is rare that a department or university feels an obligation to provide a job for his professionally trained wife. Indeed, universities regularly exploit the availability of such professional women in university communities by hiring them at lower salaries and on part-time or terminal contracts. Again, the pattern is one of translating our notions of appropriate sex roles ("institutional sexism") into employment policies that discriminate against women.

Finally, we might add here that the mobility bias also works to the disadvantage of women who are already members of a university faculty. In departments in which salary and promotion are partially based on "desirability" in the national marketplace -- as measured by job feelers and job offers -- the widespread reluctance to consider extending such job inquiries to women reduces their competitive position within their own department as well as in the national market.

---

[16]Talcott Parsons, "The American Family," in Family, Socialization, and Interaction Process, T. Parsons and R. F. Bales, eds. (New York: Free Press, 1955), pp. 13-15; T. Neal Garland, "The Better Half? The Male in the Dual Professional Family," in Toward a Sociology of Women, C. Safilios Rothschild, ed. (Lexington: Xerox, 1972), pp. 213-214.

Hiring Practices at BGSU

Turning now to hiring practices at BGSU, we obviously have no data on those who were not hired. Moreover, we have no systematic data on the hiring procedures or on the biases of decision-makers (deans, departmental chairmen, recruitment committees, and so forth), but we assume that both the procedures and the biases vary departmentally and by college. What we can do is examine certain patterns in numbers and rank that have been produced by recent hiring practices at the University.

Table 6 shows the number of new faculty added each year since 1961. Although the numbers of faculty additions show a generally steady increase, reflecting the growth of the university over the past decade, the proportion of new additions who were female has declined from the relative high percentages in the early 1960's. Since 1965, the proportion of new hires who are female has ranged from a low of 14.8% (1967 and 1968) to a high of 21.8% (1971). In general, the hiring patterns have maintained the overall University faculty sex ratio of 4 or 5 males to 1 female faculty member.

Table 7 shows the original ranks of the current faculty. It is immediately evident from the table that the bulk of recruiting for both men and women is carried out at the lower ranks, a not unexpected pattern for a relatively young, fast-growth university. However, while 7 of every 10 women are hired as instructors, only 4 of 10 men are. The proportion of men hired at each rank above instructor is about twice as large as the proportion of women hired at each of those ranks; altogether, 60.3% of male faculty were hired as assistant professors or higher as compared to 31% of the female faculty. In general, women have been hired at lower ranks than men.

TABLE VI: ANNUAL ADDITIONS TO FACULTY BY SEX 1961-1971 AS REFLECTED BY DATE OF HIRE OF CURRENT FACULTY - BGSU, 1971

Year of Hire	Male	Female	TOTAL	% Female
1961	10	5	15	33.3
1962	4	5	9	55.5
1963	15	5	20	25.0
1964	23	10	33	30.3
1965	34	7	41	17.1
1966	32	7	39	17.9
1967	52	9	61	14.8
1968	46	8	54	14.8
1969	73	17	90	18.9
1970	72	14	86	16.3
1971	86	24	110	21.8

TABLE VII: RANKS AT WHICH CURRENT FACULTY MEMBERS WERE HIRED INITIALLY AT BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY

Initial Rank When Hired:	Male N	Male %		Female N	Female %		% Female By Rank
Full Professor	27*	4.8		3	2.3		10.3%
Associate	60	10.7	60.3%	6	4.7	31.0%	9.1%
Assistant	252	44.8		31	24.0		11.0%
Instructor	223	39.7		89	69.0		28.5%
TOTAL	562	100.0		129	100.0		

*Includes one male hired at administrative post.

TABLE VIII: INITIAL RANKS OF FACULTY MEMBERS HIRED IN 1971, B.G.S.U.

Initial Rank When Hired:	Male N	Male %		Female N	Female %		% Female By Rank
Full Professor	7	8.1		0	0.0		0.0%
Associate	8	9.3	61.6%	0	0.0	29.2%	0.0%
Assistant	38	44.2		7	29.2		18.4%
Instructor	33	38.4		17	70.8		51.5%
TOTAL	86	100.0		24	100.0		

It is sometimes suggested that it is difficult to hire women at the ranks of associate or full professor (various reasons are given for this including unwillingness of "established" women to change locations, lack of distinguished women at higher ranks, and so forth) and that this difficulty accounts for the paucity of women at these higher ranks. However, the percentages of the persons hired as associate or full professors who are female (9.9% and 10.3%, respectively) do not differ significantly from the percentage of females among those hired at the assistant professor rank (11.0%). Approximately 1 in 10 persons hired at each of these ranks has been female. This constant ratio of 9 men to 1 woman at the higher ranks suggests that it has been no more difficult to hire women at the rank of professor than to hire women at the rank of assistant professor. This suggests further that there is no necessary barrier to using hiring policies as an effective avenue for affirmative action in correcting patterns of sex bias at the higher academic ranks.

Table 8 is included to show the rank distribution of the 1971 cohort of "new hires." Showing a marked similarity with the picture of original rank for the faculty as a whole, the 1971 cohort shows decisively that most of the men (62%) were hired at ranks above instructor, while the vast majority (71%) of women were hired as instructors.

The Potential Labor Pool

A common explanation for the paucity of women in many departments is that there are few well-trained, qualified women available. This is obviously the case in some academic areas. Both the sex-typing of certain occupational categories and the nature of career counseling for young women, who typically are channeled away from areas defined as "masculine,"

combine to produce low numbers of women professionals in such areas as engineering and business.

However, whether the lack of qualified women can account for the imbalance in the sex ratio in various departments at BGSU can be assessed by examining the hiring pools and academic markets from which the university can draw its faculty. According to the U.S. Office of Federal Contract Compliance, the potential labor pool for departmental units in universities is a national market composed of recent Ph.D.'s from universities throughout the nation. The OFCC suggests as a guideline for compliance with Executive Order Number 11276 as amended by Executive Order Number 11375 that the sex composition of a given departmental faculty should reflect the sex composition of recently graduated Ph.D.'s in the given academic area.

Included in Table 9 of this section are national data on the proportion of Ph.D.'s earned by women between 1960-1969 in various academic disciplines. Table 9 illustrates that, although percentage and number vary from field to field, many fields offer substantial proportions of women for potential faculty recruitment.

For purposes of illustration we can combine information from this table with information in Table 1 and compare BGSU departmental performance with the OFCC guideline. For example, the "potential" female proportion of faculty in Speech is 15.9% based on the proportion of Ph.D.'s awarded to women in Speech over the preceding decade. This compared with an "actual" percentage of females in the BGSU Speech Department of 16%, which suggests that hiring patterns in this department reflect the national availability of female Ph.D.'s in Speech. Comparisons between "potential" and "actual" percentages of females on the faculty of selected

WEAL WOMEN'S EQUITY ACTION LEAGUE

TABLE IX

Prepared June/1971 by the
Council for University Women's Progress
at the University of Minnesota

PROPORTION OF DOCTORATES EARNED BY WOMEN, BY AREA AND FIELD, 1960-1969

Data source: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. *Earned Degrees Conferred: Bachelor's and Higher Degrees.* [A publication of the Bureau of Educational Research and Development and the National Center for Educational Statistics. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office. (All public and private colleges and universities in the United States known to confer doctoral degrees are included in the survey. Professional doctoral degrees, such as M.D., however, are not listed.) The consecutive bulletins from which these original data were obtained are located in the Wilson Library Documents Division.

	Total Number of Doctorates Earned 1960-1969	Total Number of Doctorates Earned by Women 1960-1969	Percentage of Doctorates Earned by Women 1960-1969
Agriculture, Total	4462	79	1.77
Agriculture, General	115	1	.87
Agronomy, Field Crops	966	5	.52
Animal Science	872	21	2.41
Dairy Science	262	4	1.53
Farm Management	13	0	.00
Fish, Game or Wildlife Management (1961-1969)[1]	209	2	.96
Food Science	385	16	4.16
Horticulture	539	11	2.40
Ornamental Horticulture	14	0	.00
Poultry Science	211	7	3.32
Soil Science	568	2	.35
Agriculture, All other fields	308	10	3.25
Architecture	50	4	8.00
Biological Sciences, Total	17,708	2448	13.82
Premedical, Predental and Preveterinary Sciences	25	2	8.00
Biology, General	1949	395	20.27
Botany, General	1653	186	11.25
Zoology, General	2262	318	14.06
Anatomy and Histology	633	116	18.33
Bacteriology, etc.[2]	2096	355	16.94
Biochemistry	2695	471	17.48
Biophysics	429	32	7.46
Cytology	30	9	30.00
Ecology (1961-1969 only)	37	2	5.41
Embryology	45	11	24.44
Entomology	1097	46	4.19
Genetics	672	61	9.08
Molecular Biology (1968-1969 only)[3]	32	6	18.75
Nutrition (1961-1969 only)	156	45	28.85
Pathology	271	15	5.54
Pharmacology	783	87	11.11
Physiology	1145	168	14.67
Plant Pathology	692	19	2.75
Plant Physiology	203	12	5.91
Biological Sciences, All other fields	803	92	11.46
Business and Commerce, Total	3046	86	2.82
Business and Commerce, General	1372	33	2.41
Accounting	268	18	6.72
Finance, Banking (1967-1969 only)[4]	53	1	1.89
Marketing (1967-1969 only)[5]	66	1	1.52
Real Estate, Insurance (1967-1969 only)[6]	2	0	.00
Transportation (1967-1969 only)	7	0	.00
Business and Commerce, All other fields	1278	33	2.58
City Planning (1966-1969 only)[7]	44	2	4.55
Computer Science and Systems Analysis, Total (1964-1969 only)[8]	158	4	2.53
Computer Science	99	3	3.03
Systems Analysis	22	1	4.55
Computer Science and Systems Analysis, All other fields	37	0	.00
Education, Total	26,369	5230	19.83
Physical Education	1143	313	27.38
Health Education	88	26	29.55
Recreation	30	4	13.33
Education of the Mentally Retarded	118	36	30.51
Education of the Deaf (1964-1969 only) (1964-1969 only)[9]	6	4	66.67
Speech and Hearing Impaired	339	67	19.76
Education of the Visually Handicapped (1964-1969 only)[10]	3	1	33.33
Education of the Emotionally Disturbed (1965-1969 only)[11]	24	6	25.00
Administration of Special Education (1968-1969 only)[12]	14	4	28.57
Education of Other Exceptional Children[13]	391	126	32.23
Agricultural Education	228	2	.88
Art Education	194	52	26.80
Business or Commercial Education	300	89	29.67
Distributive Education, Retail Selling	28	6	21.43
Home Economics Education	124	123	99.19
Industrial Arts Education, Nonvocational	224	1	.45
Music Education	548	75	13.69
Trade or Industrial Education, Vocational	181	8	4.42
Specialized Teaching Fields, All other	756	261	34.52
Nursery or Kindergarten Education	14	12	85.71
Early Childhood Education	22	20	90.91
Elementary Education	1199	459	38.28
Secondary Education	966	154	15.94
Combined Elementary and Secondary Education	21	4	19.05
Adult Education	303	46	15.18
General Teaching Fields, All other	445	97	21.80
Education Administration, Supervision Finance[14]	7242	931	12.86
Counseling and Guidance	2357	488	20.70
Rehabilitation and Counselor Training (1964-1969 only)	80	14	17.50
History of Education, etc. (1964-1969 only)[15]	488	99	20.29
Education, General	6286	1183	18.82
Educational, Psychology (1964-1969 only)	875	224	25.60
Physical Education, Nonteaching (1964-1969 only)	36	9	25.00
Education, All other fields[16]	1296	286	22.07
Engineering, Total[17]	18,572	82	.44
English and Journalism, Total	6471	1541	23.81
English and Literature	6322	1523	24.09
Journalism	149	18	12.08
Fine Arts and Applied Arts, Total	4035	678	16.80
Art General	99	18	18.18
Music, Sacred Music	1473	199	13.51
Speech and Dramatic Arts	1978	314	15.87
Fine and Applied Arts, All other fields	485	147	30.31
Folklore (1965-1969 only)	29	8	27.59

Foreign Languages and Literature, Total	4158	1186	28.52
Linguistics	551	133	24.14
Latin, Classical Greek	506	128	25.30
French	768	311	40.49
Italian	47	17	36.17
Portuguese	14	3	21.43
Spanish	668	217	32.49
Philology and Literature of Romance Languages	380	93	24.47
German	678	171	25.22
Other German Languages	27	5	18.52
Philology and Literature of Germanic Languages	52	9	17.31
Arabic	5	1	20.00
Chinese	14	2	14.29
Hebrew	23	1	4.35
Hindi, Urdu (1961-1969 only)	2	0	0.00
Japanese	12	2	16.67
Russian	116	28	24.14
Other Slavic Languages	68	20	29.41
Foreign Language and Literature, All other fields	227	45	19.82
Forestry	558	1	.18
Geography	663	37	5.58
Health Professions, Total	1831	168	9.18
Hospital Administration	20	1	.50
Medical Technology	2	0	.00
Nursing, Public Health Nursing	18	17	94.44
Optometry	16	1	6.25
Pharmacy	563	24	4.26
Physical Therapy, Physiotherapy	1	0	.00
Public Health	418	62	14.83
Radiologic Technology	3	0	.00
Clinical Dental Services	24	4	16.77
Clinical Medical Services	302	31	10.26
Clinical Veterinary Services	250	4	1.60
Health Professions, All other fields	214	24	11.21
Home Economics, Total	514	392	76.26
Home Economics, General	104	101	97.12
Child Development, Family Relations	174	87	50.00
Clothing and Textiles	53	52	98.11
Foods and Nutrition	134	108	80.60
Institution Management or Administration	6	6	100.00
Home Economics, All other fields	43	38	88.37
Law	268	12	4.48
Library Science	140	38	27.14
Mathematical Sciences, Total	6166	401	6.50
Mathematics	5538	348	6.46
Statistics	781	53	6.79
Philosophy, Total	1701	188	11.05
Philosophy	1520	155	10.20
Scholastic Philosophy	181	33	18.23
Physical Sciences, Total	25,736	1179	4.58
Physical Sciences, General	93	3	3.23
Astronomy	421	29	6.69
Chemistry	12,963	884	6.82
Metallurgy	213	0	.00
Meterology	245	2	.82
Pharmaceutical Chemistry (1961-1969 only)	289	13	.50
Physics	8415	168	2.00
Geology	2143	53	2.47
Geophysics	203	3	1.48
Oceanography	222	4	1.80
Earth Sciences, All other fields [18]	170	2	1.18
Physical Science, All other fields	359	18	5.01
Psychology, Total	9135	1845	20.20
General Psychology	7071	1365	19.30
Clinical Psychology (1961-1969 only)	651	163	25.04
Counseling and Guidance	138	33	23.91
Social Psychology (1961-1969 only)	309	68	22.01
Rehabilitation Counselor Training (1964-1969 only)	36	8	22.22
Educational Psychology (1964-1969 only)	137	37	27.01
Psychology, All other fields (1964-1969 only)	793	171	21.56
Religion, Total	2825	141	4.99
Religious Education, Bible	368	49	13.32
Theology	1417	49	3.46
Religion, Liberal Arts Curriculum	860	39	4.54
Religion, All other fields	180	4	2.22
Social Sciences, Total	18,662	2072	11.10
Social Sciences, General	261	27	10.34
American Studies, Civilization, Culture	257	41	15.95
Anthropology	942	202	21.44
Area or Regional Studies	384	46	11.98
Economics	3898	219	5.62
History	4943	579	11.71
International Relations	425	33	7.76
Political Science or Government	2876	253	8.80
Sociology	2361	403	17.07
Agricultural Economics	1165	12	1.03
Foreign Service Programs	11	1	9.09
Industrial Relations	96	4	4.17
Public Administration	283	23	8.13
Social Work, Social Administration	480	174	36.25
Social Science, All other fields	280	55	19.64
Trade or Industrial Training	84	0	.00
Broad General Curriculums and Miscellaneous Total	726	107	14.74
Arts, General Programs	39	9	23.08
Sciences, General Programs	84	9	10.71
Arts and Sciences, General Programs	40	5	12.50
Teaching of English as a Foreign Language	27	10	37.04
All Other Fields of Study [19]	536	74	13.81
Total All Fields (areas) reported:	154,111	17,929	11.63

1. When information was available from 1961-1969 (this field was not given as a separate category in 1960-1961), proportions were computed based on information available. If the field was not listed as a separate category for more years than 1960-1961, the information was included in the residual category. Exceptions are noted.
2. Includes Bacteriology, Virology, Mycology, Parasitology and Microbiology.
3. The status of this field prior to 1968, when it was considered separately, is not clear.

4, 6, and 6. As in 3, the same observation applies.

7 and 8. These entire areas are new.

9, 10, 11, and 12. Subsumed under other categories in earlier years.

13. Includes: Special Learning Disability, Education of the Crippled, Education of the Multiple Handicapped.
14. Includes Curriculum Instruction as well. These fields were separated for all but year 1963-1964, so it was necessary to combine them.
16. Includes History, Philosophy and Theory of Education.
16. Includes the recently listed field of Education Specialist.
17. A breakdown on Engineering was omitted from *Earned Degrees Conferred: Bachelor's and Higher Degrees* for the four academic years 1960 through 1964. Other sources investigated provided breakdown by field but not by sex.
18. Includes recent field, "Earth Sciences, General."
19. Includes recent field "Interarea Fields of Study."

departments are shown below:

Proportion Female on Departmental Faculties

Department	"Potential"	"Actual"
Speech	16%	16%
English	24	26
History	12	4
Biology	20	12
Geology	2	9
Psychology	20	6
Sociology	17	9
Journalism	12	0
Economics	6	6

Similar comparisons can be made for other departments at the university, although care should be taken to ensure comparability between categories of the national data and various of the BGSU departments.

In assessing the "performance" of BGSU relative to its hiring potential, certain variables, such as hiring criteria other than the Ph.D. and the ability of BGSU to attract talented women, must be kept in mind. Nevertheless, it is surprising that no additional qualified women have appeared in such relatively large national pools as psychology, sociology, and biology or that no women of distinction could be attracted to those departments with disproportionately low numbers of women faculty at the higher academic ranks. If affirmative efforts were made to recruit qualified women as well as men, additional departments at BGSU could approach representation of the sexes proportionate to availability in the national pool.

C. SALARY

In no other area are sex differences more evident than in salary levels. Women are paid substantially less than men in the same ranks,

holding the same degree, serving the university the same length of time, and with the same tenure status. In this section, we will document the pattern of salary differences by sex. It should be noted once again that in order to ensure comparability among salaries, twelve-month salary levels have been adjusted according to the 1971 AAUP formula to reflect a 10-month academic year salary level.

The following figures reflect the general 1971 salary pattern at Bowling Green: that is, men can be found disproportionately in the higher salary ranges, women found disproportionately at lower salary levels. As the data suggest, one out of every two persons earning less than $10,000 is female, while only one of every twelve persons earning $20,000 or more is female.

Salary	Male		Female		Total	%Female of
	N	%	N	%	N	Total
$20,000 +	55	9.8	5	3.9	60	8.3
16,000-19,999	86	15.3	11	8.5	97	11.3
13,000-15,999	176	31.1	21	16.3	196	10.7
10,000-12,999	202	36.0	52	40.3	254	20.5
<10,000	44	7.8	40	31.0	84	47.6
TOTAL	562	100.0	129	100.0	691	

Table 10 presents a summary of average salaries by rank and sex within colleges and for the university as a whole. Although the picture differs by college, in general the average salaries at each rank are lower for women than for men. In making comparisons of salary averages by sex, one should keep in mind the size of the N's on which the mean salaries are based.

For example, in Table 10, the average salary for female full professors ($19,685) in the College of Arts and Sciences is higher than the average salary for male full professors ($18,747). However, before

TABLE X.: AVERAGE SALARY BY RANK AND SEX FOR EACH COLLEGE AND FOR THE UNIVERSITY AS A WHOLE
BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY - 1971

	ACADEMIC RANK							
	Professor		Associate		Assistant		Instructor	
COLLEGE:	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Arts & Sciences	18,747	19,685	14,702	14,628	12,072	11,560	10,398	9,427
N:	(83)	(4)	(79)	(15)	(120)	(12)	(41)	(18)
Business	18,768	*	16,298	*	13,737	*	10,080	9,758
N:	(22)	(1)	(19)	(1)	(35)	(0)	(12)	(3)
Music	16,189	*	13,658	11,710	10,634	10,685	9,375	8,500
N:	(9)	(0)	(9)	(2)	(17)	(2)	(7)	(2)
Education	18,898	17,422	14,749	14,243	12,499	11,322	10,230	9,584
N:	(19)	(9)	(22)	(8)	(41)	(23)	(27)	(29)
High Salary	27,000	25,990	18,870	19,500	15,900	13,000	15,954	11,400
Low Salary	13,000	14,300	11,660	11,710	8,960	9,300	6,954	7,800
Average by Rank/Sex	18,572	17,996	14,873	14,319	12,313	11,365	10,220	9,498
Average by Rank	18,517		14,779		12,173		9,950	
N:	(133)	(14)	(129)	(26)	(213)	(37)	(87)	(52)

concluding that the women professors have no basis for complaint, we must note that we are comparing the average salary of the "top" 8 percent of the female faculty in Arts and Sciences with the average salary not of the top 8 percent of the male faculty, but rather of the top 26 percent of the male faculty. The average salary of the top 8 percent of the male faculty obviously will be much higher than the average salary of the top 26 percent of the male faculty. That it will be higher than that of the females almost goes without saying. (Table 12, which presents salary percentiles by rank for the university as a whole, does show salary differentials for comparable percentages of men and women faculty.)

Table 11 contains information on salary averages by rank and sex within each department. Although the actual value of the salaries varies by department, such that in some departments both men and women at every rank are paid higher salaries than are persons at those same ranks in other departments, nevertheless in general the average salary of women in department after department and at every rank is lower than that of men. In three-quarters of the direct comparisons that can be made, the average salary of the males is higher than that of the females.

It is interesting to note that 5 of the 9 comparisons in which the average salaries of females were higher than those of males occurred at the rank of associate professor. This is the rank at which women faculty tend to "rest" several years longer than their male counterparts (see Sections D and E of this report). It is tempting to speculate that at least some of these female associate professors actually should be full professors and indeed would be if they were male. (Note that if these women were full professors, in every case their salaries would fall below the salary averages of male full professors in their departments.)

AVERAGE SALARIES AT BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY -- BY COLLEGE, BY DEPARTMENT, BY RANK, AND BY SEX
REFLECTING, ALSO, NUMBERS OF MEN & WOMEN WITHIN EACH CATEGORY -- ACADEMIC YEAR
1971-1972

TABLE XI.

Code	DEPARTMENT	PROFESSORS		ASSOCIATES		ASSISTANTS		INSTRUCTORS		TOTAL STAFF		
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female		Male	Female
	ARTS & SCIENCES:											
111	School of Art	16,532 (7)		13,366 (3)		11,372 (11)			9,033 (3)	24	21	3
112	Speech	19,544 (7)		14,650 (9)	13,628 (3)	12,339 (11)	11,397 (2)	12,701 (4)	11,400 (1)	37	31	6
131	German & Russ.	15,950 (1)			13,500 (2)	13,512 (2)		11,145 (5)	10,300 (1)	11	8	3
132	Romance Lang.	17,662 (4)	14,200 (1)	13,350 (2)	13,000 (1)	11,400 (4)	11,816 (3)	10,375 (2)	9,650 (4)	21	12	9
140	English	18,657 (8)	19,550 (1)	14,538 (10)	13,685 (2)	12,045 (10)	11,132 (4)	9,335 (13)	9,142 (7)	55	41	14
150	History	18,414 (7)	18,900 (1)	14,475 (8)		11,088 (9)		9,700 (3)		28	27	1
160	Philosophy	18,900 (1)		14,625 (2)	15,200 (1)	11,328 (7)		9,700 (4)		15	14	1
231	Biology	18,525 (7)		14,573 (7)	14,275 (2)	12,406 (9)			10,000 (1)	26	23	3
240	Chemistry	18,035 (5)		15,909 (5)	17,535 (1)	11,990 (4)		9,500 (1)	8,300 (1)	17	15	2
250	Geology	17,860 (4)		14,275 (3)	13,750 (1)	13,091 (3)				11	10	1
260	Physics	21,400 (1)		15,620 (2)		12,480 (7)		10,200 (1)		11	11	-
280	Mathematics	18,734 (6)		14,590 (5)		12,156 (20)				31	31	-

		PROFESSORS		ASSOCIATES		ASSISTANTS		INSTRUCTORS		TOTAL STAFF		
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female		Male	Female
330	Geography	17,650 (5)		13,905 (3)		11,541 (4)		10,875 (4)				
340	Pol. Science	19,125 (4)		13,000 (1)		12,975 (6)	12,150 (2)	11,300 (2)		16	16	-
351	Psych. Dept.	21,019 (10)	25,990 (1)	14,917 (14)	19,500 (1)	12,078 (5)				15	13	2
352	Psych Clinic	19,022 (1)								31	29	2
360	Sociology	19,432 (5)		16,050 (5)	16,640 (1)	12,738 (8)	11,650 (1)	12,000 (2)		1	1	-
TOTAL COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES		18,747 (83)	19,685 (4)	17,702 (79)	14,628 (15)	12,072 (120)	11,560 (12)	10,398 (41)	9,427 (18)	22	20	2
BUSINESS:										372	323	49
120	Journalism	19,390 (1)		16,300 (1)		12,716 (6)						
281	Computer Sci.	19,860 (2)		17,509 (1)		14,400 (1)		10,275 (1)		8	8	-
301	Quant. Anal. & Control	18,470 (5)		16,683 (6)		14,630 (5)		9,500 (1)		5	4	1
302	Business Law	17,400 (2)		15,600 (1)		12,800 (1)				22	21	1
303	Marketing	19,200 (4)		16,000 (2)		13,166 (3)				4	4	-
320	Economics			15,900 (5)	15,500 (1)	13,740 (10)		10,000 (1)		9	9	-
371	Business Ed.	18,750 (3)	16,400 (1)	15,827 (2)		13,700 (2)		11,603 (3)	9,500 (1)	17	16	1
304	Finance & Ins.	17,100 (2)				14,150 (4)		9,500 (1)		12	10	2
										7	7	-

	PROFESSORS		ASSOCIATES		ASSISTANTS		INSTRUCTORS		TOTAL		
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	STAFF	Male	Female
305 Management	19,800 (3)		17,000 (1)		14,416 (3)		9,500 (2)		9	9	-
TOTAL COLLEGE OF BUSINESS	18,768 (22)	* (1)	16,298 (19)	* (1)	13,737 (35)	* (0)	10,080 (12)	9,758 (3)	93	88	5
SCHOOL OF MUSIC:											
100 Admin.	18,523 (1)							8,500 (1)	2	1	1
101 Theory			12,760 (2)		10,370 (7)				9	9	-
102 Education	16,767 (2)		14,455 (2)		10,500 (1)	10,500 (1)	9,935 (2)	8,500 (1)	9	7	2
103 Performance Studies	15,607 (6)		13,699 (5)	11,710 (2)	10,855 (9)	10,870 (1)	9,152 (5)		28	25	3
TOTAL SCHOOL OF MUSIC	16,189 (9)	* (0)	13,548 (9)	11,710 (2)	10,634 (17)	10,685 (2)	9,374 (7)	8,500 (2)	48	42	6
COLLEGE OF EDUC.:											
401 Education	18,949 (14)	17,866 (3)	14,548 (13)	14,650 (1)	12,403 (17)	11,950 (6)	10,845 (10)	9,927 (11)	75	54	21
402 Indus. Ed.	18,580 (3)		15,576 (3)		12,550 (7)		10,100 (1)		14	14	-
404 College Stu. Personnel	19,145 (1)		15,800 (1)						2	2	-
611 Home Econ.		17,000 (3)		13,500 (1)		11,949 (8)	9,400 (2)	9,704 (10)	24	2	22
741 H.P.E. - Men	18,899 (1)		14,567 (5)		12,574 (17)		9,811 (12)		35	35	-
742 H.P.E. - Women		17,400 (3)		13,740 (5)		10,081 (8)		8,802 (7)	23	-	23

	PROFESSORS		ASSOCIATES		ASSISTANTS		INSTRUCTORS		TOTAL STAFF		
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female		Male	Female
020 Library Sci. & Instr. Media				17,100 (1)		12,476 (1)	10,564 (2)	10,075 (1)	5	2	3
TOTAL COLLEGE OF EDUCATION	18,898 (19)	17,422 (9)	14,749 (22)	14,243 (8)	12,499 (41)	11,322 (23)	10,230 (27)	9,584 (29)	178	109	69
GRAND TOTAL UNIVERSITY	18,572 (133)	17,995 (14)	14,872 (129)	14,319 (26)	12,313 (213)	11,365 (37)	10,220 (87)	9,498 (52)	691	562	129

It appears that the price some women must pay for being female is measured not only in terms of salary inequity, but also in terms of lower academic rank.

Another picture of salary differentials by sex is shown in Table 12, which presents salary percentiles by rank and sex. These salary figures reflect the salary level within each sex-rank category below which we find X percent of faculty members (or above which we find (100-X) percent of faculty members). For example, we find that the 50th percentile (or median) for male associate professors is $14,750; that is, half of the male associate professors earned more than this amount and half earned less. The 50th percentile for female associate professors is $13,780, almost $1,000 less than the median male salary at this rank.

In comparing male-female decile salary levels in Table 12, we find than male salaries in 35 of the 36 possible comparisons are higher than female salaries. Moreover, in three-fourths of these comparisons, the salary advantage of the male is $500 or more. The one reversal in which female salary is higher than male occurs at the 90th percentile in the rank of associate professor. Once again, we suggest that far from being over-paid, these women have been under-promoted; they probably should be full rather than associate professors.

Academic rank, tenure status, highest degree earned, and length of service are often suggested as "explanations" of pattern discrimination in salaries. That is, the reason one finds women disproportionately in the lower salary ranges, so the argument goes, is that women are found disproportionately in the lower paid ranks of assistant professor and instructor, for example. In short, the reason that their salaries are low is not because they're women, but because they're disproportionately

TABLE XII: SALARY PERCENTILE BY RANK AND BY SEX - BGSU, 1971

	RANK AND SEX							
	Professor		Associate		Assistant		Instructor	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
N:	133	14	129	26	213	37	87	52
PERCENTILE	SALARY (rounded to nearest $10)							
10%	15,640	14,660	13,290	12,490	10,610	10,090	8,810	8,370
20%	16,500	15,600	13,730	13,080	11,300	10,430	9,300	8,870
30%	16,960	16,820	14,070	13,330	11.560	10,910	9,520	9,110
40%	17,810	17,110	14,440	13,500	12,000	11,130	9,680	9,360
50% (Median)	18,300	17,250	14,750	13,780	12,290	11,480	10,150	9,500
60%	19,030	18,020	15,210	14,000	12,590	11,680	10,550	9,560
70%	19,480	18,960	15,540	14,640	12,930	12,070	10,790	9,840
80%	20,250	19,420	16,000	15,840	13,340	12,230	11,110	10,280
90%	21,740	21,540	16,540	17,280	14,050	12,450	11,740	10,550
Mean Salary	18,572	17,996	14,873	14,319	12,313	11,365	10,220	9,498

in the lower academic ranks (and the reason that men's salaries are higher is not because they're men but because they're disproportionately in the higher ranks). This argument suggests then that the correlation of sex with salaries is a spurious one, more apparent than real.

We can examine this argument with the data in Tables 13 and 14. In Table 13, we show the average salaries of male and female faculty for various categories of academic rank, highest degree earned, tenure status and length of service. It is undeniably clear that male salaries are higher than female salaries in all but one of these bivariate comparisons. Moreover, the male salary advantage is quite large, ranking from a difference of $544 at the associate professor rank to a difference of $3,683 at the 10-12 years of service level.

Table 14 presents a multivariate analysis of the salary differentials in which we compare male and female salaries when tenure level, highest degree earned, and academic rank are simultaneously controlled.[17] Tenure status is used in this table as a rough approximation of length of service; that is, term contracts are generally held by those with the shorter terms of service, probationary contracts are generally held by those with

---

[17]There are additional multivariate analytic tools available for the analysis of the impact of sex on salary levels. A study of salary levels at the University of Illinois used multiple regression analysis to investigate the existence of sex-based inequities. In this study sex was found to contribute significantly ($p<.05$) to the explanation of salary level after the impact of department, rank, highest degree earned, experience, honors, and number and types of publications were statistically taken into account. The "cost" of being female at the University of Illinois was estimated to be $845.96. Cf., Jane Loeb and Marianne Ferber, "Sex as Predictive of Salary and Status on a University Faculty," Journal of Educational Measurement (8:4), Winter 1971, pp. 240-243.

TABLE XIII: COMPARISON OF AVERAGE SALARIES OF MALE AND FEMALE FACULTY FOR CATEGORIES OF SELECTED VARIABLES, FULL-TIME FACULTY - BGSU, 1971

	Average Salary				Difference
	Male		Female		
	Amount	(N)	Amount	(N)	M - F
Academic Rank:					
Professor	$18,572	(133)	$17,996	(14)	$ 576
Associate	14,873	(129)	14,319	(26)	544
Assistant	12,313	(213)	11,365	(37)	948
Instructor	10,220	(87)	9,498	(52)	722
Highest Degree Earned:					
Bachelor's	$11,143	(14)	$ 9,917	(7)	$2,026
Master's	11,804	(171)	10,535	(74)	1,269
Doctorate	15,186	(372)	14,484	(48)	702
Professional	15,046	(5)	-	-	-
Tenure Status:					
Tenured	$16,215	(269)	$14,072	(55)	$2,143
Probationary	12,570	(217)	10,877	(43)	1,693
Term	10,708	(76)	9,582	(31)	1,126
Years of Service - BGSU:					
1 or less	$12,016	(86)	$ 9,846	(26)	$2,170
2 - 3	12,589	(151)	11,237	(30)	1,352
4 - 6	13,758	(137)	11,400	(26)	2,358
7 - 9	14,845	(66)	12,486	(24)	2,359
10 - 12	16,430	(27)	12,747	(7)	3,683
13 - 15	17,787	(25)	16,700	(2)	1,087
16 - 18	17,395	(13)	17,508	(4)	- 113
19 - 21	17,785	(13)	15,000	(2)	2,785
22+	17,180	(44)	15,854	(8)	1,326

TABLE XIV: COMPARISON OF AVERAGE SALARIES FOR MALE AND FEMALE FULL-TIME FACULTY, CONTROLLING FOR TENURE STATUS, HIGHEST DEGREE EARNED, AND ACADEMIC RANK - BGSU, 1971

	Bachelor's Degree				Master's Degree				Doctorate				Professional			
	Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female	
	Amount	(N)	Amount	(N)	Amount	(N)	Amount	(N)	Amount	(N)	Amount	(N)	Amount	(N)		
TENURED FACULTY																
Professor	16,430	(1)	-	-	16,059	(14)	-	-	18,861	(115)	17,995	(14)	17,400	(2)	-	
Associate	-	-	-	-	14,227	(16)	13,716	(10)	14,873	(71)	14,130	(13)	15,600	(1)	-	
Assistant	11,500	(1)	-	-	12,619	(22)	11,000	(11)	12,697	(22)	11,970	(5)	-	-	-	
Instructor	-	-	-	-	10,951	(3)	10,150	(2)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
PROBATIONARY FACULTY																
Professor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Associate	-	-	-	-	14,670	(2)	-	-	15,170	(34)	17,150	(3)	-	-	-	
Assistant	12,100	(4)	10,400	(1)	11,830	(33)	10,948	(6)	12,483	(109)	11,767	(9)	12,800	(1)	-	
Instructor	10,565	(3)	9,175	(4)	11,004	(32)	9,877	(20)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
TERM-CONTRACT FACULTY																
Professor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25,000	(1)	-	-	-	-	-	
Associate	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14,849	(5)	-	-	-	-	-	
Assistant	-	-	-	-	12,044	(7)	11,425	(3)	11,271	(14)	11,700	(2)	-	-	-	
Instructor	9,594	(5)	8,360	(2)	9,547	(42)	9,257	(22)	11,500	(1)	9,500	(2)	12,032	(1)	-	

terms of service intermediate in length, and tenure contracts by those with the longer terms of service.

If overall salary differentials are solely a function of the different numbers of men and women faculty in various categories of highest degree earned, faculty rank, tenure status, and length of service, then we would expect these salary differences to disappear when we examine men and women of the same rank and tenure status and highest degree earned. But it is clear from Table 14 that when we control simultaneously for tenure status, highest degree earned, and academic rank, the salary differences between similarly-qualified men and women remain. For example, when the average salary of tenured female Ph.D.'s who are full professors is compared with the average salary of men with the same qualifications, we can see that the dollar cost of being female is $865.00. In general, the salary differences are large, and in 15 of the 17 possible comparisons, the salary difference favors the male faculty.

In sum, Table 10 through 14 of this section consistently document the magnitude and direction of the pattern of salary discrimination by sex at Bowling Green State University. Salary differences do not disappear when salaries for men and women of the same status, according to each of four common "objective criteria," are compared. More significantly, the salary differentials by sex do not disappear when all of the objective criteria are controlled simultaneously. That is, when the joint impact of degree, rank, and tenure on salary levels is taken into account, sex continues to have a differential impact on salaries. We can conclude from these data that sex makes a difference in the salary a faculty member receives at Bowling Green: women "pay" for being female.

D. RANK

Patterns in Current Rank

Table 15 of this section shows the distribution of men and women in each of the colleges by rank and sex. Corresponding data for individual departments are included in Table 1 of Section A. In the university as a whole, fewer than 1 in 10 professors is female, while more than 1 in 3 instructors is female. At the assistant and associate professor ranks, approximately 1 in 6 is female. Men are twice as likely to be professors as women are, while women are two and one-half times as likely to be instructors as men are.

The following data illustrate the rank patterns of men and women faculty in the university as a whole:

	Men		Women		% Female of Total
	N	%	N	%	
Professor	133	24	14	11	9.5
Associate	129	23	26	20	16.8
Assistant	213	37	37	29	14.8
Instructor	87	16	52	40	37.4

Men are found at the higher ranks and less so at lower ranks. But the pattern is reversed for the women faculty: the higher the rank, the fewer the women.

Certainly rank is a function of a number of factors. We are interested in determining whether the sex differentials in rank remain when we take others of these factors into account. Two such "explanatory factors" will be examined here: highest degree earned and length of academic experience.

TABLE XV: DISTRIBUTION OF FACULTY BY RANK BY COLLEGE BY SEX - BGSU, 1971

PER CENT DISTRIBUTION

Academic Rank:	Total University		College							
			Arts & Sciences		Business		Music		Education	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Professor	23.7	10.8	25.7	8.2	26.0	*	21.4	*	17.4	13.0
Associate	23.0	20.2	24.4	30.6	21.2	*	21.4	*	20.2	11.6
Assistant	37.8	28.7	37.2	24.5	37.4	*	40.5	*	37.6	33.3
Instructor	15.5	40.3	12.7	36.7	15.4	*	16.7	*	24.8	42.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	*	100.0	*	100.0	100.0

NUMERICAL DISTRIBUTION

Academic Rank:	Total University		College							
			Arts & Sciences		Business		Music		Education	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Professor	133	14	83	4	22	1	9	0	19	9
Associate	129	26	79	15	19	1	9	2	22	8
Assistant	213	37	120	12	35	0	17	2	41	23
Instructor	87	52	41	18	12	3	7	2	27	29
Total	562	129	323	49	88	5	42	6	109	69

*N is too small to calculate stable percentage.

The sex differentials in rank still remain, although reduced in magnitude, when highest degree earned is taken into account, as shown in Table 16. Thus, sex differentials in rank cannot be explained away by reference to the different proportions of men and women with doctorates or master's degrees on the faculty.[18]

In addition to highest degree earned, we can examine seniority -- or length of academic experience -- as another factor that enters into the determination of academic rank. All other things being equal, the longer a person has been active in the field, the higher a rank he or she might be expected to have. In Table 17, the rank/sex distributions are shown for 5-year categories of academic experience, which is measured as the total number of years (at BGSU and elsewhere) since receiving the highest degree. Within each of the academic experience categories, the sex differences in academic rank remain marked. For example, within 5 to 9 years after earning the highest degree, approximately twice as many men proportionately as women are full professors while almost half as many men proportionately as women are instructors after 5-9 years "in the field."

Moreover, at every experience interval -- but particularly those representing ten or more years of experience -- the proportion of men at the highest two ranks far outweighs the corresponding proportion of women. For example, over 3/4 of men with 10-14 years experience are either associate or full professors. Less than half of the women with the same amount of experience have been promoted to these ranks. Just as with highest degree earned, sex differentials in rank cannot be explained away by reference to the differences in length of experience between men and women faculty. Regardless of the amount of academic

---

[18] A more detailed analysis of this is contained in the preliminary report of this committee. We can note here, however, that 2/3 of the male faculty and 3/8 of the female faculty have PH.D.'s.

TABLE XVI: ACADEMIC RANK BY HIGHEST DEGREE EARNED, BY SEX
BGSU - 1971

	≤ Master's				Doctorate[a]			
	Males		Females		Males		Females	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Academic Rank:								
Professor	15	8.1	0	0.0	118	31.3	14	29.2
Associate	18	9.7	10	12.3	111	29.4	16	33.3
Assistant	67	36.2	21	25.9	146	38.8	16	33.3
Instructor	85	46.0	50	61.8	2	0.5	2	4.2
TOTAL	185	100.0	81	100.0	377	100.0	48	100.0

[a]Includes 5 males with professional degrees.

TABLE XVII: LENGTH OF ACADEMIC EXPERIENCE EXPRESSED IN PERCENTAGES - BY RANK AND BY SEX - BGSU, 1971

	Years Since Earning Highest Degree									
	0-4 yrs.		5-9 yrs.		10-14 yrs.		15-19 yrs.		20+ yrs.	
	M%	F%	M%	F%	M%	F%	M%	F%	M%	F%
Academic Rank:										
Professor	0.0	1.9	13.2	6.1	50.0	23.1	65.6	50.0	70.2	15.8
Associate	14.1	1.9	42.7	27.3	26.6	23.1	15.6	30.0	19.3	52.6
Assistant	62.7	31.6	27.9	36.3	14.1	15.4	14.1	10.0	10.5	26.3
Instructor	23.2	64.6	16.2	30.3	9.4	38.4	4.7	10.0	0.0	5.3
Total %	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	241	54	136	33	64	13	64	10	57	19

experience, sex differentials in rank remain: larger proportions of women than men are in the lower ranks whatever the length of academic experience.

E. PROMOTION PATTERNS.

There are two major questions to be asked about promotion patterns: 1) What is the volume of flow from one rank to another and does this differ between men and women? That is, are proportionately more men than women promoted relative to their total numbers; and 2) What is the rate of flow and does this differ by sex? In other words, how long does it take to move up the ranks?

In Table 18, we can examine the proportions of men and women who have made shifts in rank by comparing their original rank with their current rank. We assume that those persons whose original rank is the same as their current rank have not been promoted, and we assume that those persons whose current rank differs from their original rank have been promoted one or more ranks while at Bowling Green. We should note that the original rank determines to some extent the amount of movement possible; specifically, those hired as professors cannot be promoted further; those hired as associate professors can be promoted only one step higher in the rank hierarchy; those hired as assistant professors can be promoted two steps; and so on. What Table 18 does not show are the intervening steps between "origin" and "destination" for those individuals who have been mobile; but we can get an idea of the proportions of men and women faculty whose career mobility patterns are similar in broad outline.

The data in Table 18 suggest that when we exclude those hired initially as full professors, 266 of 535 (or 49.7%) of the male faculty and

TABLE XVIII: CAREER MOBILITY OF MEN AND WOMEN FACULTY AS SHOWN BY A COMPARISON OF INITIAL RANK WITH CURRENT RANK FOR EACH SEX - BGSU, 1971

	Professor		Associate		Assistant		Instructor	
Initial Rank When Hired (N)	M* 26	F 3	M 60	F 6	M 252	F 31	M 223	F 89
Current Rank (Fall, 1971):								
Professor (N)	100.0% (26)	100.0% (3)	41.7% (25)	16.7% (1)	19.4% (49)	19.4% (6)	14.3% (32)	4.5% (4)
Associate (N)			58.3% (35)	83.3% (5)	22.2% (56)	22.6% (7)	17.0% (38)	15.7% (14)
Assistant (N)					58.4% (147)	58.0% (18)	29.6% (66)	21.3% (19)
Instructor (N)							39.1% (87)	58.5% (52)
Total %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*Excludes one male originally hired at an administrative post, currently at the rank of professor.

and 51 of 126 (or 40.5%) of the female faculty have been promoted at least once from the time of hiring to 1971. That is, the career mobility of the current male faculty has been slightly higher than that of the current female faculty during their tenure at Bowling Green.

Perhaps it would be well to point out here that a shift to a higher rank is in all likelihood related to the length of tenure at the University. Assistant professors with only one year of service, for example, would in general be less apt to be promoted than assistant professors of longer tenure. If this is the case, then we might expect the mobility of the female faculty to be higher than it is, because the length of service of the female faculty at every rank is greater than that of the male faculty, as the following figures attest:

	Length of Service at BGSU (Average Number of Years)	
	Male	Female
Professor	14.06	14.07
Associate	7.82	11.89
Assistant	3.74	4.57
Instructor	2.52	2.94

Table 18 also suggests that while the movement of men and women originally hired as assistant professors is almost identical in terms of percentages now at higher ranks, the movement patterns of men and women hired as instructors or as associate professors are quite different. Whereas, 2 of every 5 men hired as an associate professor have been promoted to full professor, only one in every 6 women has. Fully 83% of the women hired at this rank are still at this rank as compared with 58% of the men. This suggests that there may be some basis for the complaint that it is more difficult for women than for men to obtain a promotion to the full professorial rank.

When we look at the patterns of upward movement for those hired as instructors, we see again that proportionately more men than women have moved, and further, that men have moved to the higher ranks in greater proportions than women have. Thus, proportionately three times as many men as women have moved from instructor to full professor, while women are almost one and a half times as likely as men to remain at the instructor rank. Moreover, men have moved in larger proportions than women to the assistant and associate professor ranks.

In sum, almost one-half of the male faculty has been promoted at least once while at Bowling Green as compared with 2/5 of the female faculty. Moreover, relative to their total numbers, men have moved to the higher ranks in greater numbers than women have. Thus, there is evidence that the volume of upward flow through the academic ranks is greater for men than for women.

To answer the question of how long does it take on the average to move from rank to rank, we can look at Tables 19 and 20. Table 19 shows the average number of years from the date the highest degree was earned to the year the individual was promoted to his or her current rank, controlling for highest degree earned, current rank, and college. As might be expected, regardless of sex, it takes persons with only a master's degree much longer to move through the ranks than for those with Ph.D.'s. Even so, women with M.A.'s move more slowly than men with M.A.'s. Although the pattern varies by college, in general, women have taken taken longer than men to reach their present rank. This is clearest for the rank of associate professor in which, with one exception, the women who are currently associate professors have worked from 2.5 to 12.8 years longer on the average than men to reach that rank.

TABLE XIX: AVERAGE NUMBER OF YEARS FROM YEAR HIGHEST DEGREE WAS EARNED TO YEAR PROMOTED TO PRESENT RANK - SHOWN BY HIGHEST DEGREE EARNED BY RANK AND BY SEX WITHIN EACH COLLEGE - BGSU, 1971

	≤Master's $\bar{x}$ years		Doctorate[a] $\bar{x}$ years	
	M	F	M	F
Arts & Sciences:				
Professor	18.9	*	10.9	9.1
Associate	14.8	20.3	4.3	7.6
Assistant	6.2	10.7	0.6	0.5
Business:				
Professor	25.0	*	9.8	8.0
Associate	*	*	2.0	5.0
Assistant	5.6	*	0.3	*
School of Music:				
Professor	18.5	*	8.4	*
Associate	14.2	27.0	5.7	1.0
Assistant	5.1	13.5	2.0	*
Education:				
Professor	8.0	*	7.8	7.4
Associate	14.8	18.0	3.2	5.7
Assistant	6.9	11.1	0.3	0.6

[a] Includes 5 males with professional degrees.

TABLE XX: AVERAGE NUMBER OF YEARS SERVED AT CURRENT RANK WITHIN EACH COLLEGE -- BGSU, 1971

	Arts & Sc.		Business		Music		Education	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Professor	5.1	7.2	6.9	6.0	4.4	*	6.7	5.9
Associate	3.2	4.3	2.0	3.0	2.6	1.0	2.3	5.9
Assistant	1.7	1.2	1.4	*	1.2	1.5	3.2	2.0
Instructor	1.5	1.9	0.9	0.6	2.3	2.0	1.8	2.4

Table 20 shows for each college the average number of years men and women have served at their current rank. As with Table 19, the picture varies within each college. For example, in the College of Arts and Sciences, women at every rank except assistant professor have served at their present ranks longer than men. Thus, not only has it taken women longer on the average than men to get to their present rank (Table 19), but they have been at that rank longer than the men (Table 20). One commonality among three of the four colleges is the longer service for women at the associate professor rank. Indeed, in the College of Education where we find most women, it is 3.6 years longer. Thus, there is some support for the contention that women have to "rest" at the associate rank longer than men before being promoted to full professorship. Combined with the fact that proportionately fewer women than men do move into full professorships, this longer waiting period at the associate rank could be a major source of frustration, dissatisfaction, and complaint among academic women.

Table 21 shows the relationship between current rank and chronological age. Table 21 suggests that almost four times as many men as women have achieved the ranks of associate or full professor by age 40. Moreover, while the majority of men 40-49 have achieved the two higher academic ranks, we do not find a majority of women in those ranks until they are ten years older. Finally, while nearly all men reach the higher ranks by the time they approach retirement, only two-thirds of the women do. In general then, while most men reach the two higher academic ranks in their forties, most women must wait until their fifties and sixties to do so and indeed one of every three academic women never will reach the higher ranks.

To summarize our information on promotion patterns, it appears that fewer women than men are mobile, fewer women than men reach the higher

TABLE XXI: ASSOCIATE AND/OR FULL PROFESSORS BY CHRONOLOGICAL AGE-GROUPINGS - SHOWN AS PERCENTAGES OF TOTAL MALE AND TOTAL FEMALE FACULTY
BGSU, 1971

	Male Faculty		Female Faculty	
AGE GROUP:	% With Assoc. or Prof. Rank	Total All Ranks	% With Assoc. or Prof. Rank	Total All Ranks
<40 years	23%	323	6%	52
40 - 49 years	63%	150	30%	40
50 - 59 years	88%	60	68%	28
60+ years	93%	29	67%	9
TOTAL	47%	562	31%	129

ranks, and women move through the ranks more slowly than men over the course of their careers. It is reasonable to expect that individuals will move at different speeds and will differ in the points at which they "rest" or "peak." However, it is more difficult to justify the existence of a pattern that distinguishes one class of individuals (men) from a second class of individuals (women) and that consistently finds the latter class in a disadvantaged position relative to the former.

F. TENURE

Table 1 of Section A shows the proportions of men and women with tenure in each department of the university. The following data summarize the information in Table 1 and reflect the picture of the tenure status of men and women in the full-time faculty for the university as a whole:

Tenure Status of Full-time Faculty BGSU 1971	Men		Women		Total		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	Female
Tenured	268	47	55	43	323		17
Probationary	218	39	43	33	261		16
Term	76	14	31	24	107		29

These data suggest that women are slightly less likely than men to have tenured or probationary contracts and more likely to have term contracts than men.

In addition to information on how many women as compared to men have been granted tenure, we also need information on the amount of time it requires to gain tenured status and whether this differs by sex. In Table 22, we can examine the differential proportions of men and women tenured faculty according to the number of years elapsed between the

TABLE XXII: NUMERICAL, PERCENTAGE, AND CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTIONS OF MEN AND WOMEN TENURED FACULTY BY NUMBER OF YEARS BETWEEN YEAR-OF-HIRE AND YEAR TENURE GRANTED - BGSU, 1971

Years From Hire to Tenure	Numbers		Percentage		Cumulative Percentage	
	M	F	M	F	M	F
0*	22	3	8.2	5.5	8.2	5.5
1	3	0	1.1	0.0	9.3	5.5
2	9	1	3.4	1.8	12.7	7.3
3	79	14	29.5	25.5	42.2	22.8
4	41	9	15.3	16.4	57.5	49.2
5	64	11	23.9	20.0	81.4	69.2
6	18	9	6.7	16.4	88.1	85.6
7	13	2	4.9	3.6	93.0	89.2
8	6	3	2.2	5.5	95.2	94.7
9	3	1	1.1	1.8	96.3	96.5
10	1	0	0.4	0.0	96.7	96.5
11+	9	2	3.4	3.6	100.1	100.1
TOTAL	268	55	100.1	100.1		

*Hired with tenure.

TABLE XXIII: FACULTY WITH TENURE BY CHRONOLOGICAL AGE-GROUPINGS - SHOWN AS PERCENTAGES OF TOTAL MALE AND TOTAL FEMALE FACULTY
BGSU, 1971

AGE GROUP:	Male Faculty % With Tenure Status	Male Faculty Total Males (N)	Female Faculty % With Tenure Status	Female Faculty Total Females (N)
< 40 years	22.0%	323	17.3%	52
40 - 49 years	74.7%	150	40.0%	40
50 - 59 years	93.3%	60	82.1%	28
60+ years	100.0%	29	77.8%	9
TOTAL	47.0%	562	43.0%	129

is particularly important for women who, as with other minority groups, form the bulk of what is treated as a marginal labor force. In times of economic stress, unemployment and underemployment rates are higher for women than for other segments of the labor force.[19] Disproportionate numbers of women with term contracts as compared with men would appear to be a particularly serious form of inequality on the basis of sex.

We know from data presented above (see p. 56) that women are almost twice as likely as men (24% of women vs. 14% of men) to be employed on term contracts in 1971 at Bowling Green. Table 24 presents data on the proportions of men and women on term contracts according to the number of years of service at Bowling Green. Although the percentages vary, what is immediately apparent is that larger proportions of women than men have term contracts for each year-of-service category. The fact that these proportions are high (for <u>either</u> sex, but especially for women) in the longer years-of-service categories is shocking since it implies that certain persons have continually been "strung along," year by year on one-year contracts for four, five, six years or more. The personal toll this might exact in terms of anxiety about one's job future or inability to plan effectively can only be guessed at. What is clear, however, is that women have this type of job-contract experience in larger proportions than men do.

---

[19] <u>Handbook</u>, pp. 69; 73.

TABLE XXIV: PERCENTAGES OF MALE AND FEMALE FACULTY ON ONE-YEAR (TERM) CONTRACTS IN 1971 REFLECTED BY YEARS OF SERVICE AT BGSU

	YEARS OF SERVICE							
	1		2		3		4	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Percentage With Term Contracts	46.5	65.4	18.9	20.0	13.0	14.3	8.5	44.4
Total Incl. (N) Tenured & Proba.	86	26	74	15	77	14	47	9

	5		6		7		8+	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Percentage With Term Contracts	9.1	11.1	0.0	25.0	6.5	12.5	0.6	2.5
Total Incl. (N) Tenured & Proba.	55	9	35	8	31	8	157	39

III. RESPONSES TO THE CHALLENGE OF DISCRIMINATION

A. THE ACADEMIC RESPONSE: DEVELOPMENT OF WOMEN'S STUDIES

The National Scene

An understanding of the rapid growth of Women's Studies programs and proliferation of Women's Studies courses in the U.S. during the last two years may be obtained by comparing the first Guide to Current Female Studies, published by the Modern Languages Association Clearinghouse on Female Studies, December, 1970 with its October, 1971 Guide. The first Guide listed 110 courses. As of October, 1971, 600 were listed.[1] Professor Florence Howe, co-editor and compiler of the Guide, now estimates at least 100 more have been established, making a total of 710 which have been called to her attention.[2] The MLA Clearinghouse describes seventeen coordinated Women's Studies Programs.

Degree-granting programs are offered as follows: M.A., Cambridge-Goddard Institute, Sarah Lawrence College; B.A., Richmond College (CUNY), University of Washington; major with emphasis on Women's Studies, Douglas College (N.J.), and San Francisco State College. SUNY/Buffalo began a Women's Studies College in May, 1970.

---

[1] Information taken from Oct. 15, 1971 New Guide to Current Female Studies, MLA Commission on the Status of Women, editors Carol Ahlum and Florence Howe, Know, Inc., Pittsburgh, Pa., 15232.

[2] Lecture given at Bowling Green State University, May 2, 1972, Florence Howe, SUNY/Old Westbury.

The Women's History Research Center, Berkeley, California, contains a complete archive of material by and about women. Several universities have established Women's Centers; many of them are encouraging special library collections of material dealing with women. The Overbury Collection at Barnard College, New York, emphasizes women writers. The Center for the Continuing Education of Women, University of Michigan, seeks to encourage women whose educations have been interrupted to return to academic life.

Several universities are currently advertising for applicants to teach Women's Studies; Barnard, Cornell, University of Pittsburgh, SUNY/Buffalo and many West Coast schools have expanding Women's Studies programs.

Women's Studies courses range all the way from conventional academic approaches such as Sociology of Women, Women Novelists, Women and the Law, to innovative and experimental consciousness-raising sessions or courses with titles such as Auto Mechanics for Women, Fix-It Course, Agit/Prop. Career Planning Workshop for Women, Psychological Aspects of Pregnancy and Infant Development, La Chicana, Asian Women, Philosophy of Sex and Love, and Basic Accounting.

Many of the courses include male concerns: Masculinism and Feminism in 19th Century America; Male and Female, An Interdisciplinary Approach; and Social Dynamics of Sex Roles.

Most of the courses are connected with departments of English, History, Sociology, Political Science, Psychology, Education, Anthropology, and Economics. Business Schools, Law Schools, Departments of Industrial and Labor Relations list several courses in Women's Studies. American Studies Programs, Experimental Programs, Programs of Continuing Education are well

represented as sponsors of Women's courses. Some French, German, and Spanish Departments offer courses in literature by women. One college has a course in Readings in Oriental Studies: Relative Roles of Male and Female.

Major emphasis of many courses seems to lie in the area of compensating for gaps in conventional education, acquainting the student with women in history, women writers, or problems and status of women in various cultures. A large number of offerings are of an interdisciplinary nature: Politics, Government and Legal Status of Women, Images of Women in Literature and Art, Feminism as Revolution, and Cross-Cultural and Literary Perspectives of Women.

Many of the courses have as their focus increased awareness on the part of both men and women of changes in status and roles. Several are aimed at "consciousness-raising," bringing into verbalized state the vague feelings and attitudes people often have about themselves and each other. A large number of the courses aim at an examination of the relationship between private experience and cultural mores and institutions. Many engage both student and teacher in the development of theory and perspective; some attempt to analyze the growing potential of the women's movement as an instrument of social change. Certainly, most of the Women's Studies courses and programs are themselves very deeply involved in change in education, both in aims and in methodology.

Most of the courses are taught by women. Many, however, are team-taught by both male and female instructors; some are taught by males alone. A large number of courses are planned and taught by students, sometimes with a faculty member as sponsor.

Opportunities for publication in Women's Studies are opening at very rapid rates. Publishing ventures concerned with Women's Studies include: Free Women's Press, 2828 Benvenue Ave., Berkeley Calif., 94704; Source Book Press, Division of Collectors Editions, Ltd., Dep't. QA, 185 Madison Ave., NYC, 10016; The Feminist Press, SUNY/Old Westbury, Old Westbury, N.Y., 11568; The Women's Free Press, c/o Know, Inc., P.O. Box 10197, Pittsburgh, Pa., 15232; Women's Heritage Series, Inc., 838 15th St., Santa Monica, Calif.; Women's History Research Center (Laura X), 2325 Oak St., Berkeley, Calif.

A new interdisciplinary journal, Women's Studies: An Interdisciplinary Journal, Gordon & Breach, Inc., 440 Park Ave., South, New York, N.Y., 10016, Editor, Evelyn Datz, will begin publication this spring. Articles are solicited.

A Female Studies Newsletter is being organized and will appear for the next several months on a page of The Spokeswoman, 5464 S. Shore Dr., Chicago, Ill., 60615. Janice Law Trecker, 33 Westfield Road, West Hartford, Conn., 06119, will edit the Newsletter.

Older journals and newspapers include:

Aphra, A feminist Literary Journal, Box 332, Springtown, Pa., 19081. $3.50/4 issues.

Lilith Magazine, P.O. Box 1895, Seattle, Washington, 98111.

The New Feminist, 67 Huntley St., Toronto 5, Ontario, Canada. $4.00/yr. No. Journal. Send international m.o.

New Woman, P.O. Box 24202, Fort Lauderdale, Fla., 33307. $4.50/yr.

No More Fun & Games, a Journal of Female Liberation, 371 Somerville Ave., Sommerville, Mass., 02143. $1.00/issue.

Up from Under, 339 Lafayette St., N.Y., N.Y., 10012, Bi-monthly, $2.50/5 issues.

Women, A Journal of Liberation, 3028 Greenmount Ave., Baltimore, Md., 21218, Qtrly. $4.00/year.

The Mary Wollstonecraft Newsletter, 282-6 Corry Village, Gainesville, Fla., 32601.

A complete listing of feminist publications and presses is being prepared by Ruth Altmann, 44 E. 84 St., N.Y., N.Y., 10028. It will be published this spring in Concerns, the Women's Caucus for the Modern Languages Newsletter, which also publishes a report on "Research in Progress," a compendium of information about research currently being done on images of women, women writers, Women's Studies, feminism and women in academe.

The Center for Women's Studies and Services, San Diego State College, San Diego, Calif., 92115, is in the process of annotating a Selected Bibliography of Women Writers, a world bibliography of women writers.

Detailed course descriptions are available in Female Studies I, Sheila Tobias; Female Studies II, Florence Howe; Female Studies III, Florence Howe and Carol Ahlum; Female Studies IV, Elaine Showalter and Carol Ohmann; and American Women and American Studies, Betty Chmaj, all published by Know, Inc.

Papers and proceedings of the University of Pittsburgh/MLA Women's Commission Conference on women's studies held in Pittsburgh, November, 1971 are published in Female Studies: Women and Education: A Feminist Perspective, Rae Lee Siporin, ed., also by Know, Inc.

The Local Scene

A survey of Bowling Green State University faculty women reveals there are six courses currently being taught which deal primarily with Women's Studies; one is to be taught during summer term ; ten are proposed for next

year. Although no coordinated program exists, concerned faculty have attempted to confer informally in order to avoid time conflicts, course duplication, etc. As of Spring, 1972, courses include:

Sociology of Women, Greer Litton Fox, Sociology

Sexual Roles in Literature, Carlene Bagnall Blanchard, English, American Studies

Psychology of Women, Doris Williams, Experimental Studies

Images of Women in Literature and Art, Nancy Steppe, Experimental Studies

Women's Liberation, 1845-Present; History, Issues, Goals and Strategies, Susan Cornillon, Experimental Studies

Current Myths in Family Dynamics, Margaret McGeever, Experimental Studies

During Summer, 2nd session:

Contemporary American Women Writers, Carlene Bagnall Blanchard, English, American Studies

Fall, 1972; Winter, 1973; Spring, 1973 (proposed courses)

American Women Poets, Martha Eckman, English

Ideas in American Literature: The American Woman as Writer, Alma Payne, English, American Studies

Sexual Politics, Shirley Meeker, Political Science

Women's Movement Seminar, Susan Cornillon, Experimental Studies

Women and the Theatre, Annette Johnson, Experimental Studies

Current Myths in Family Dynamics, Margaret McGeever, Experimental Studies

Psychology of Women, Doris Williams, Home Economics

Literature and Society: Attitudes Toward Women, Men, and Sex, (Grad. Course) Carlene Bagnall Blanchard, English, American Studies

Women and the Novel, Donna Fricke, English

Seminar (400 Level): The Sociology of Women, Greer Litton Fox, Sociology

A number of instructors are proposing that present courses which allow for topical or thematic handling be centered on the feminist movement or problems of women in our society. Several faculty members, both male and female, have indicated that they plan to include Women's Studies topics in their courses. These include courses in History, Home Economics, English Education, Children's Literature, Romance Languages, Survey of American Literature, Education, and Sociology.

There is a need for course proposals in Women and the Law, Women in History, and Women in Business.

A beginning has been made toward a Midwest Women's History Library. It is currently housed in the Popular Culture section. Ruth H. Hoffman, librarian, B.G.S.U., has put together a selected bibliography on women; it is available at the library. The Polemics File at the library contains a number of current women's liberation publications. The Women's Center, Student Services Building, has a number of books, articles, and current publications.

The Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) in the library is a valuable source of data on topics related to women. Faculty and students involved in research will find it helpful.

Looking in the Future: Decisions should be made soon on whether Bowling Green will continue its informal, uncoordinated approach to Women's Studies, develop a separate program or find a place for it under an existing program. Considerable student interest has been expressed in an undergraduate major as well as for work on a graduate level from students who wish to be trained for research/teaching positions in Women's Studies. Currently, this is possible only to a limited degree in the English Department where one Ph.D. candidate is emphasizing Women's Studies in connection with work in the

Popular Culture Program. Several women have developed concentration on Women's Studies topics in the American Studies M.A. program.

With a growing emphasis at the University on the development of general studies and interdisciplinary approaches, it seems likely that some kind of "home" may be found for Women's Studies. We suggest that an informal "called meeting" of faculty, students and administrators interested in seeing such a development be scheduled for early in the summer quarter and that explorations be made toward meeting requirements for both undergraduate and graduate programs. A series of public lectures and open discussions among faculty concerned with Women's Studies would be another method of building a base.

Some of us involved with education have become aware of large gaps in our understanding and teaching of the history, literature, and social problems of Blacks, American Indians, and other minority groups. So, too, many are becoming aware of gaps occurring in our understanding and teaching of the experiences and contributions of women, both in American culture and others. Many instructors will look to their existing courses for inclusion of an expanded view of human development; others will build specific Women's Studies courses. Both approaches hold promise, not only for the development of skills and imagination presently under-utilized by our society, but also for the growth of more humane relationships between men and women.

IV. RESPONSES TO THE CHALLENGE OF DISCRIMINATION

B. THE LEGAL RESPONSE:

Women, Education, and the Law -- Legal Supports for Women in Educational Institutions, Including Affirmative Action

The most important recent legal developments affecting university women have been at the federal level. Many of the actions taken by state governmental agencies, in Ohio and elsewhere, have been mandated by the necessity of making state practices congruent with federal law and with court decisions. In other instances, increasing consciousness of inequities in women's status and opportunities (partly stimulated by federal action) have prompted state-level changes.

Federal. Historically, females have been a legally deprived group. Though presumably guaranteed by the Constitution, equal protection of the laws has frequently been denied to many women. Among the most flagrant examples was Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Although Title VII forbids sex discrimination in employment, Section 702 exempts women faculty and staff in universities from coverage of the law.

The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights had had jurisdiction to deal with the deprivation of civil and human rights of citizens deprived of these rights by reason of their color, race, religion or national origin. It has had no jurisdiction concerning sex discrimination.

The first major federal action in alleviating the injustices to

university women was taken by President Johnson on October 13, 1968, when he issued Executive Order 11375, forbidding discrimination based on sex by all Federal contractors. This amended a previous executive order (11246) which forbids discrimination by all Federal contractors because of race, color, religion or national origin.

Under this Executive Order, hundreds of charges have been filed against universities. In some cases, millions of dollars worth of federal contracts have been held up until the universities implemented affirmative action plans to overcome injustice to women faculty. In a number of instances, women faculty have received back pay retroactive to 1968.

The most significant development at the federal level is, however, the passage of the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972. Under this law, educational institutions of all kinds, as well as state and local governments, are no longer exempted from provisions of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

This means that for the first time any individual, as well as the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission itself, will be able to file suit to compel a school to cease discrimination on the basis of sex; the law is effective whether the university is receiving federal funds or not.

Chester Gray, Area Director of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, said recently:

> The full resources of the United States Government will now be able to be used effectively to fight discrimination as it pertains to women.... Where we find serious and widespread discrimination because of sex bias individually or collectively, we will file charges; if a settlement cannot be reached around the conference table, we will now take it to court.

Most far-reaching in its potential effects may be the proposed Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution now being ratified by the states. Affecting students as well as faculty and staff, the amendment would forbid discrimination in the employment of women in all publicly-supported institutions.

State. Recent court decisions, legislative enactments, and executive orders at the state level have evidenced an attitudinal reorientation movement to prevent discrimination in Ohio.

Governor John J. Gilligan is issuing a number of executive orders dealing with discrimination. The first (Jan. 27, 1972) required equal employment opportunity on state and state-assisted construction contracts. Target date for the second is April 19 (Material in this report is taken from a preliminary draft); primary purpose is to assure equal employment opportunity on state and state-assisted contracts for the purchase of goods and services.

The following policy statement from the second executive order is significant:

> Article I - Declaration of Policy: That non-discrimination and equal employment opportunity are the policy of the State of Ohio in all of its decisions, programs and activities. To that end, all state departments, agencies, commissions and employees under my jurisdiction shall vigorously take affirmative action to insure equality of opportunity in the internal affairs of state government, as well as in their relations with the public, including those persons and organizations doing business with the State.
>
> Affirmative action requires more than vigilance in the elimination of discriminatory barriers to employment on the grounds of race, color, religion, national origin, ancestry, and sex. It must also entail positive and aggressive measures to insure equal opportunity in the areas of hiring, promotion, demotion or transfer, recruitment, layoff or termination, rate of compensation, and in-service or apprenticeship training programs. This affirmative action should include efforts required to remedy all effects of present and past discriminatory patterns and practices and those actions necessary to guarantee equal employment opportunity for all people.

Ms. Emily Leedy has been appointed Director of the Women's Services Division of the Ohio Bureau of Employment Services; her responsibilities include promoting programs to improve the employment opportunities of women. The Women's Services Division gathers and disseminates various data and information on programs and activities of federal, state, and local governments and organizations pertinent to women.

Responses to women's problems by the Ohio General Assembly include proposals in Senate and House for ratification of the proposed amendment to the federal Constitution. The amendment would prohibit discrimination against women in all sectors.

Shortly after the Ohio Supreme Court ruled Ohio's female labor laws discriminatory and in violation of the federal Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Ohio House passed on March 28 a bill (HB-192) requiring employers to treat female employees the same as male workers, paying them equally for equal work and eliminating most of the "protective" restrictions on what women may do. At this writing, the bill is awaiting Senate action.

A series of recent decisions by the Ohio Supreme Court indicates that when discrimination against female employees in any field exists, there is a strong possibility that the women can win their cases in the courts.

Bowling Green State University. The most significant response to the status of women problem at Bowling Green State University was the approval on February 24, 1972, of a non-discrimination policy by the Board of Trustees. The statement reads, in part:

> This policy statement is designed to establish the action of Bowling Green State University, its President, Trustees, Faculty and Administrative Officers to provide equal employment opportunity to all qualified persons without regard to race,

> creed, color, national origin, sex or age, and to take affirmative action in instances where such opportunity may be limited. Further, the statement establishes administrative procedures for both a periodic review of employment practices and for correction procedures in cases which do not ensure equal employment opportunities. . .

Regarding implementation, the policy statement says:

> Each dean, director, chairman or other employer within the University shall be responsible for the implementation of this Statement of Equal Employment Opportunity at Bowling Green State University and for a program of Affirmative Action within the division. Appropriate action will be taken by the Director of the Office of Equal Employment Opportunity to ensure compliance with this policy.
>
> Each dean shall maintain an accurate inventory of the college faculty showing composition by race, creed, color, national origin, sex and age. The dean shall also compile information for each faculty member with regard to compensation, time of promotion, provision for leaves and other benefits. Where opportunities for women and minority persons appear not to have been provided by existing employment practices, the college dean shall report to the Affirmative Action Committee the goals for employment of women and minority persons and the procedures by which these goals will be achieved. All goals should be stated in terms of specific targets and deadline dates. The inventory and the proposals for affirmative action shall be reviewed and approved annually by the Affirmative Action Committee.

Ms. Vivian Lawyer was appointed Director of the B.G.S.U. Office of Equal Opportunity; an Affirmative Action Committee was appointed to advise the Director.

In summary, B.G.S.U. has a policy of non-discrimination and has set up appropriate machinery for implementing the policy. It must be noted, however, that the financial means to overcome salary discrimination have not been provided. In its April 1972 meeting, the Board of Trustees approved a budget item of only $22,000 for inequity pay for women for 1972-73. The amount is only a fraction of the need documented by the statistics and tables in this report; indeed, it is less than the amount required simply to operate the Equal Opportunity Office itself.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN FACULTY

In order to effect fair and equal treatment at Bowling Green State University and to comply with federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission guidelines as required by Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972 and with guidelines issued by the Office of Federal Contract Compliance as required by Executive Order No. 11276, as amended October 1967, the Ad Hoc Committee on the Status of Women Faculty requests that the Faculty Senate endorse and support the following recommendations:

Affirmative Action

1. The policy statement against discrimination adopted by the Board of Trustees on February 24, 1972 should be implemented in all areas of the University.

2. The Affirmative Action Program outlined by the Board of Trustees shall be actively supported by all Bowling Green State University administrators, faculty, and staff.

Assistant Provost for Women

3. An Assistant Provost for Women shall be appointed. Her duties will include, but are not limited to, the following:

a. acting as Chairperson of the permanent Commission on the Status of Women (see #4 below);
b. promoting the development of Women's Studies and other academic training or counseling programs that can foster the more effective development and utilization of potential skills of women in the BGSU community;
c. informing the University of and involving it in the development of local, regional, and national opportunities to improve the status of women in and through higher education;
d. assisting in the recruitment and placement of women students, faculty, administration, and staff;

e. filling a liaison office between the Office of Equal Employment Opportunity and campus women;
f. serving as woman's advocate in internally adjudicated cases of discrimination against women;
g. assisting in obtaining legal counsel for women who seek redress of grievances.

Appointment shall be made to this post after the position is advertised and posted and after all applicants are screened by a committee appointed by the Faculty Senate. This screening committee shall include representatives of women's groups on campus.

Commission on the Status of Women

4. A permanent Commission on the Status of Women at Bowling Green State University shall be appointed by the Senate and charged with the duty of continual evaluation of the University's progress in eliminating sex discrimination. The Commission in conjunction with the Director of the Office of Equal Employment Opportunity and the Assistant Provost for Women should recommend appropriate Senate action in any areas where discrimination based on sex remains.

Equalization of Status of Men and Women Faculty

5. Female faculty members are to be paid on the same salary basis as male faculty. Where "merit" is used to determine appropriate salary level, the meaning of "merit" is to be specified and validated.

6. Women are to receive faculty promotions on the same basis as men. Where promotions are based on "merit," the meaning of "merit" is to be specified and validated.

7. Women are to receive tenure on the same basis as men. Where tenure is granted on the basis of "merit," the meaning of "merit" is to be specified and validated.

8. Women shall gain membership on graduate faculty when they have qualifications equal to those of men admitted to membership. Where membership is granted on the basis of "merit," the meaning of "merit" is to be specified and validated.

9. Men and women faculty should receive fair and equal treatment in the assignment of summer teaching, overloads, scheduling, assignment of student assistants, award of travel monies, and other "extras." Where such assignments are made on the basis of "merit," the meaning of "merit" is to be specified and validated.

10. To ensure implementation of the preceding five recommendations, to remove the burden of initiation of grievance proceedings from the aggrieved individual, and to prevent jeopardy of an individual who may wish to lodge a complaint, an anonymous and systematic file review procedure shall be established by the Director of the Office of Equal Employment Opportunity.

In addition to such a file review procedure, the University must make readily and openly available to all individuals such information as they need to determine whether they might wish to lodge a complaint of discrimination with the Director of the Office of Equal Employment Opportunity.

The University must take steps to ensure carefully that it in no way -- formally or informally -- jeopardizes an individual who seeks to pursue by redress of grievances his or her rights to equal employment opportunity.

Women in Policy-Making Posts

11. There must be an increase in the representation of women faculty in policy-making bodies at all levels of University operation. Administrators should actively seek out and appoint women to policy-making positions and committees.

12. There must be an increase in the number of women appointed to the most responsible administrative positions, including highest salaried categories.

Hiring Policies

13. In hiring new faculty, there shall be no discrimination on the basis on sex.

14. In those divisions of the University which have in the past employed few or no women, deliberate and aggressive efforts to recruit and hire qualified women faculty should be made.

Within the course of the next three years, every department and program within the University should be able to demonstrate that the ratio of women faculty is proportionate to the number of women Ph.D.'s available in the national pool of qualified women graduates of each profession. National data are now available through most major professional organizations and through the Association of American Colleges; most compilations cover the period of at least the last ten years. The U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare also publishes Earned Degrees Conferred: Bachelor's and Higher Degrees, showing degrees earned annually by women according to area and field.

15. All new positions and unfilled positions must be posted, announced publicly, and advertised in the major professional publications and other appropriate bulletins before candidates can be considered. Lists of available qualified women candidates currently being published by professional organizations must be consulted, with no prior assumption concerning mobility, marital status, etc.

Part-Time Positions

16. The University should provide for more part-time faculty positions above the instructor level. This can provide a means of offering specialized courses and can allow the University to take advantage of current cooperative attitudes of neighbor universities to share and exchange faculty members on a part-time basis.

17. All fringe benefits granted other faculty should be extended to part-time faculty. Part-time faculty should have access to promotions, salary increments, and membership on the graduate faculty. In awarding promotions, salary increments, and membership on the graduate faculty, the same criteria should be applied to part-time faculty as to full-time faculty.

18. Recognition of the value of previous part-time teaching experience should be made by the University when hiring full-time faculty, both male and female; for example, credit for one full year of experience should be given for two half-years of teaching.

Child-Care and Maternity Leave Policies

19. A child-care center for children (infants through age 12) should be established by the University within the coming year in Bowling Green, preferably on or near the campus, financed by federal, state, and/or local funds, for the use of faculty, administrators, staff, students, and local persons.

20. We endorse the following policies concerning maternity:

a. Maternity leave, defined as that period of time a woman is unable to work because of childbirth or complications of pregnancy, should be considered a temporary disability under the University's leave policy.

b. Any University policies written or unwritten that apply to temporary disabilities other than pregnancy or childbirth should be applied to pregnancy and childbirth in the same manner. For example, any systems or practices of the University for compensating employees for time off -- such as for sick leave, temporary

disability insurance, or informal understandings that employees be paid while temporarily disabled -- should be applied in the same manner to pregnancy and childbirth.

c. There should be no forced leaves of absence. The determination of the length of a woman's leave of absence for pregnancy or childbirth should be a matter between a woman and her doctor.

d. Pregnancy should not be a justification for discharge of an employee.

e. When a female employee resumes work after a leave of absence for childbirth, she shall return to her original job with her former status and pay just as if she had been absent for any other temporary disability.

f. Female employees on leave of absence for childbearing shall continue to accrue all seniority rights for job security, promotion and pensions, and other fringe benefits.

g. The University should not subscribe to any health insurance or temporary disability insurance plan which excludes or restricts benefits for pregnancy, maternity, or abortion coverage.

h. No additional or different benefits or restrictions should be applied to disability because of pregnancy or childbirth, and no pregnant woman employee should be in a better or worse position in relation to job-related practices or benefits than an employee similarly situated suffering from other disability.

i. The University's leave policy should apply equally to married and unmarried women.

j. Leaves of absence for childbearing purposes, like unpaid leaves of absence for continuation of education or personal emergencies, should include re-employment rights and should be available to both mothers and fathers. The length of time that these benefits are retained should not be less than that allowed for other purposes such as leave for military service.

(These recommendations are outlined in Maternity Policies and the Educational Institution, Association of American Colleges.)

Language

21. The language of all University documents, the Charter, the Catalogue, bulletins, descriptions of programs, offices, etc., shall be examined. Where reference is made to "he," "his," "men," etc. and the referrent is clearly both men and women, the words "she," "her," "women," etc. shall be inserted or the words "persons," "person," etc. shall be substituted. Publicity, including photographs, shall include both men and women faculty and students.